

THE
QUARTERLY REVIEW
OF
THE EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH.

OCTOBER, 1897.

ARTICLE I.

IMMORTALITY IN THE LIGHT OF SCRIPTURE AND NATURE.

By W. F. EYSTER, D. D.

Nowhere in the wide range of theological literature, can we find a more concise, clear and satisfactory exposition of the scriptural doctrine of immortality, than that which is presented in the following digest of the teachings of some of the great Lutheran theologians of the period immediately following the Reformation. "In death the natural life of man ceases, it is true, as this was conditioned by the peculiar connection between body and soul, but the soul does not succumb as the body, but lives on with all the attributes and powers that belong to its nature. * * For the immortality of the soul reason has from time immemorial set up an array of proofs but we become incontrovertibly certain of it through the positive declarations of the Holy Scriptures. * * From them we learn, also, this much concerning the condition of the soul after death, that its lot immediately after death is a happy or unhappy one, just as its possessor in this life embraced salvation through Christ or not. * * The doctrine of an intermediate condition of the soul, in which it is neither happy nor unhappy, is therefore erroneous; also, the Roman Catholic view, according to which not two, but five different places

VOL. XXVII. No. 4.

56

ements
e have
f eight
s, with
ntirely

IND.

are to be assumed, where we are to suppose the souls of the departed to be. * * The separation of body and soul which is occasioned by death, is not of permanent continuance, but the time will come, as we are positively assured in the word of God, in which God will re-awaken the body and reunite it with the soul that belonged to it before death. * * This will be in substance the same body with which the soul was united in this life, but endowed with new attributes, adapted to the nature of the circumstances then existing. * * But just as the condition of souls after death is different according as they were godless or pious in this life, so will also the bodies of the resurrected receive different attributes according as a happy or a miserable life is their portion."

It is interesting and important to observe, first of all, in this exposition of the doctrine of man's immortality by Lutheran theology, the emphasis which is laid on one of the grand principles of the Reformation, the supreme authority in matters of religious faith of the word of God. The incontrovertible evidence of the immortality of the soul, its condition immediately after death, the future reunion of soul and body, the nature and attributes of the resurrected body are sought and found in the Sacred Scriptures. The revelation of all the great doctrines which concern the destiny and salvation of man has been progressive. It is not, therefore, a matter of surprise that the doctrine of the future state is much less clearly unfolded in the Old Testament than the New. In the former there are passages neither few nor doubtful which imply man's immortality, hopes expressed by righteous men for themselves of a life with God hereafter, and intimations in the prophets of the future state. But what was partially revealed under the old economy is far more clearly revealed under the new. Objects before dimly discerned in the gloom now stand clearly unveiled so that immortality as shown by Christ has become in one sense a new doctrine. By his teaching and resurrection our Saviour made it not a vague hope but a glad certainty. He enlarged our knowledge of the nature of the future life, and so revealed its fulness as to make this doctrine give new motive to a holy and happy life on earth. To

those who learn to trust him, who believe that he came forth from God with a message of truth and reality for man, his word is enough for faith, for conviction, for hope. He brings "life and immortality to light through the Gospel." And yet so important, so critical is the question for each of us, that he adds something more to his bare word,—his own resurrection! The assurance that Jesus Christ, who lived on earth, who died on the cross, and was committed a mutilated, dead body to the tomb, rose uninjured and then exchanged an earthly for a heavenly life, puts to flight the sad forebodings which rise like spectres from the grave, and helps us to conceive of the believer's appointed triumph over death. "According to his abundant mercy God hath begotten us again unto a lively hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ to an inheritance incorruptible, undefiled and that fadeth not away reserved in heaven."

CONTENTS OF THE DOCTRINE.

The scriptural doctrine of immortality as expounded by Lutheran theology includes the *continued conscious existence of the soul* when the natural life of man ceases. "The soul lives on with all the attributes and powers that belong to its nature." This view recognizes and includes the scriptural anthropology, that man is compounded of two distinct substances, body and soul, that the body as the penalty of sin is mortal and corruptible until the resurrection, that the soul by divine appointment and creation is indestructible and immortal, and although designed for a bodily organism, is capable of independent life and action.

This scriptural view stands opposed to the materialistic notion that the soul is merely a function of the body and perishes with it. For if there be no substance but matter and no force but such as is a mere phenomenon of matter, and if the form in which physical force manifests as mind or mental action depends on the highly organized matter of the brain, then when the brain is disorganized the mind ceases to exist. But if, as the Bible plainly teaches, the soul and body are two distinct substances, then the dissolution of the latter does not necessarily

involve the end of conscious existence of the soul or of its independent action.

There are some Christian believers, who reject the theory of the identity of mind and matter, who yet hold that mind can not act or manifest itself without a material organ. Thus, for example, Isaac Taylor in his well known "Physical Theory of Another Life," says: "As extension is a property of matter, we can not imagine that the soul without a body is or can be in any place, or that it has any kind of relationship to the visible and extended universe. To its union with body mind is indebted for its sensations and perceptions, for its power over matter. The soul after death, therefore, must either cease its activity, at least in reference to all out of itself, or be furnished *at once* with a new body." He assumes this supposition to be a fact, and then says: "Have the dead ceased to exist? No; for there is a spiritual body and another vehicle of human nature, as well as a natural body, and, therefore, the dissolution of the animal structure leaves the life untouched." The view just stated is generally held by the so-called liberal and Unitarian Christians of the present day, who discard the orthodox view of a future resurrection, and hold to an *anastasis* immediately after death, which consists in the entrance of the soul out of the mortal body into a spiritual organism. * * It must be admitted that our consciousness and experience show that in this life there is an intimate and vital union between the mind and body, and that they act and react on each other. Their mutual relation is admitted to be mysterious. We have no sufficient reason to deny that the soul can and does exist and act after death; that the body may be disorganized, reduced to dust, and still the soul retain its conscious life and activity although disembodied. This appears to be the clearly revealed doctrine of the Bible. It speaks of angels as spirits incorporeal and yet ascribes to them place and power to produce effects in the spiritual and material worlds. Why, then, deny to disembodied human spirits place or power or relations to the outward universe? When Paul desired to be *absent from the body* and present with the Lord, he knew that his conscious personal existence was to be contin-

ued after the dissolution of his body. * * We find no sufficient support in the Sacred Scriptures for the supposition of a spiritual body evolved from the mortal body immediately after death. The Bible does not appear ever to speak of man's having any other body than his present earthly tabernacle, the body now inhabited by the soul, to be in the last day reanimated. * * The great statesman, Charles Fox, once asked an English nobleman, "My lord, what do you think of the state of the soul after death?" When his friend hesitated to make reply, Mr. Fox continued—"That the soul is immortal, I am convinced. The existence of the Deity is a proof that spirit exists; why not therefore the soul of man? And if such an essence as the soul exists, by its nature it must exist forever: it must be immortal. How it acts, as separated from the body, is beyond my capacity of judgment. I have a mortal disease and am fast sinking into the grave and this mystery I shall soon know."

The doctrine of the soul's conscious existence after death stands opposed to the false system of *pantheism*. Pantheism not only denies the personal existence of God, affirming that the universe is God and God is the universe, but it also denies the individual subsistence of man. He is but a moment in the life of God; a wave on the surface of the sea; a leaf which falls and is renewed year after year. When the body, which makes the distinction of persons among men, perishes, personality ceases with it. There is no conscious existence, therefore, after death. Man's individual being, his personality, ceases with death. The absorption of his soul into nature called God, of the finite into the infinite, is the highest destiny that pantheism can promise for man. * * It is sufficient to say of this false theory that it is the worst form of atheism, that it contradicts the plain teachings of the Sacred Scriptures as well as the laws of belief impressed on our nature; that it subverts the very foundation of religion and morality.

A *conditional* continuous existence after death over against an *absolute* or *natural immortality* of the soul has been taught by some Protestant Christians. Their central proposition is that without and outside of Jesus Christ there can be no immortality

for any human soul: that it is not a quality or part of the nature of a sinful soul. Accordingly they teach that only those who have faith in the Giver of Life can receive it. All who are outside of him, by virtue of the poison and extinguishing power of sin, must eventually end in annihilation. The doctrine of immortality is *conditioned* by faith and a holy life. This view is opposed to the general belief of the Christian Church, and, we think, finds no support in any just interpretation of Holy Scripture. Evidently it teaches that no soul can ever die in the sense of becoming extinct. No piety is necessary in order that any soul may live on forever, and no impiety can lead to its annihilation. The soul is deathless independently of both. God can not be provoked to extinguish the immortality of the most provoking spirit in the universe. The life of the body may be periled and cut short in judgment, but sin can never rouse judgment against the vitality of the soul, for devouring fire can not consume it, nor the worm that dieth not waste it. The endless being of every soul is a matter unalterably fixed by creation. Neither providence nor judgment will ever disturb that appointment. Gerhard has well said: "God could, if he wished, reduce the soul to nothing and altogether extinguish it: but because he wished and decreed it to be immortal, it continues through and because of the will of the immortal Creator. The soul is not immortal in the same manner as God, that is, essentially and independently, for in that sense God alone is said to have immortality, (1 Tim. 6 : 15) but through the grace of creation, because it was so fashioned by God as not to have in itself an inner principle of corruption, but to be incorporeal, invisible and immortal."

Lutheran theology teaches, further, that we learn from the Holy Scriptures *this much concerning the condition of the soul after death that its lot immediately after death is a happy or unhappy one*, just as its possessor embraced salvation through Christ or not."

"The souls of men separated from the body," says Quenstedt, "do not sleep, neither are they insensible until the time of the resurrection." The disembodied spirit does not enter a dream-

land, a condition of torpor and utter oblivion till awakened by the trump of God along with the risen body. "We believe," says Hutter, "that the souls of the pious attain essential blessedness immediately after they have been separated from the body," (Phil. 1 : 23 ; Luke 23 : 43 ; John 5 : 24 ; Rev. 7 : 4, 15), "but that the souls of the wicked undergo their own undoing," (1 Pet. 3 : 19). In the parable of the rich man and Lazarus it was an essential part of the truth our Lord intended to convey, when the angels are represented as carrying the spirit of the beggar into Abraham's bosom, that conscious happiness followed immediately after death. Christ's words to the dying, penitent and believing thief, "To-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise," are sufficient to set at rest this comforting assurance that the gate of death and the gate of glory are one to the believer. No wonder St. Paul, with such a blessed certainty before him, could say : "We are confident I say and willing rather to be absent from the body and present with the Lord." In the graveyard that surrounds one of the old churches of the city of Philadelphia, an upright marble slab marks the grave of a pastor's deceased wife. The bereft husband in token of his hope and comfort caused this simple inscription to be engraved on the tombstone : "Absent from the body,—Present with the Lord!"

Lutheran theology discards the doctrine that there is some intermediate state of purification for the soul, preparatory to being introduced into the presence of the Lord. The doctrine of purgatory was rejected by the Lutheran Church not only because it had no foundation in scripture, but especially as conflicting with the doctrine of justification by faith alone. Every thing that is ascribed to the satisfactions either of purgatory or the intercession of the saints, detracts from the merit of Christ which alone cleanses us from sins.

The revealed doctrine of immortality as interpreted by Lutheran theology embraces as an essential element the future re-animation of the body, its reunion with the soul that belonged to it before death, and its investiture with "new attributes adapted to the nature of the circumstances then existing."

This is peculiarly a doctrine of revelation. The outer world

gives us a few hints as to the possibility of a truth beyond the province of reason. The germ expanding into a perfected blossom,—the little grain of wheat buried in its tiny grave of inert clod, bursting forth into green and fruitful stalk,—the torpid caterpillar cradled in a dark cell, becoming the birth place of beautiful insect, mounting to heaven on wings of purple and gold,—these are some familiar analogies of the re-animation of the human dead, and yet these are mere hints, as are our instinctive longings for the restoration of the earthly tabernacle. The doctrine implies a miracle the most stupendous. All mere rational belief is staggered by the first thought of what is meant by raising and reconstructing the mortal part of man. The resurrection of the body is an essentially Christian doctrine as well as an essential part of Christianity. In the Creed which we have repeated from infancy, we have been taught to say confidently—"I believe in the resurrection of the body." And there is not a doctrine of the Gospel that is more strongly, clearly and fully declared. "This corruptible shall put on incorruption and this mortal shall put on immortality." "The dead shall be raised incorruptible." Remembering that the soul is not all of man; remembering that it needs body and soul in union to constitute the perfect human being; remembering that the body is redeemed with Christ's blood as well as the soul;—the great apostle hesitates not to say, that only when this corruptible has put on incorruption and this mortal immortality, *then* shall be brought to pass the saying that is written,—"Death is swallowed up in victory!" Though it be true that "the souls of believers are at death made perfect in holiness and do immediately pass into glory," their full and perfect glorification only takes place at the reunion of body and soul.

According to the characteristics imparted to those raised from the dead, as the saved or lost, their resurrection is termed—"The resurrection of life," or "The resurrection to judgment." In his song of praise and triumph over death and the grave in the fifteenth chapter of first Corinthians, St. Paul describes the qualities which shall be peculiar to the pious and believing alone, and to sum up all tells us that their resurrected bodies shall be

made in conformity with the glorified body of Christ. But though the transformation must necessarily be great, personal identity will remain undestroyed. No change but this that the shifting tent will be transmuted into "a building of God," reared of permanent and imperishable materials, a bodily structure that shall know no decrepitude, smiles that shall never die, new powers conferred which earth may have longed for but never possessed,—all emulous of the divine glory, and instinct with burning and untiring zeal in the divine service. Glorious body, indeed, without sin, without pain, without weakness or weariness.

Our latest thoughts of the Scriptural doctrine of immortality reach beyond the resurrection and the general judgment, to that "forever" which awaits the re-embodied believer. St. Paul describing these last events of man's earthly history, ends with the words,—*"And so shall we ever be with the Lord."*—"What a volume" says an eloquent writer is contained in these words. To think that after millions on millions of years and ages shall have rolled by, still I shall be on the threshold of immortal being, on the confines and outskirts of limitless life. My lifetime commensurate with that of God himself. His throne the centre of my bliss, *eternity* the circumference." The immortality thus suggested is an idea so sublime, so vast that no thought can measure it. It is an ocean without a shore. The lowliest child of Adam's race, if immortal, is an august being. An immortal man! An undying consciousness! A moral rational, embodied being, thinking, acting, feeling, rejoicing or suffering forever, having some destiny, some condition of existence lasting as eternity.

"How complicate, how wonderful is man?
An heir of glory, frail child of dust!
Helpless immortal! Insect infinite!"

NATURAL AND MORAL GROUNDS FOR BELIEF IN IMMORTALITY.

It has pleased God in his wisdom and love to reveal great religious truths to man through various channels of communica-

tion, through the works of his creative power, through visible providence in the order and government of the world, through the intuitive perceptions and laws of primary belief he has impressed on man's mortal and moral constitution, and above all and more clearly than in all, through the express communications he has made by holy men of old, and especially by his Son, Jesus Christ, as contained in Holy Scripture. These oracles of God, in whatever form they are uttered, must, when rightly understood and interpreted, be found in perfect harmony. The proof of immortality which is incontrovertible and which is suited to all understandings is found in the Gospel, sealed by the blood and confirmed by the resurrection of Christ. But this is made impressive by a demonstration of its harmony with the teachings of nature. Nature and revelation in the Gospel speak with one voice on the great theme of man's future being. The voice in both is that of God. Reason enlightened by revelation accords with and adopts its doctrine of immortality. It is a doctrine written alike in the sacred Scriptures, in the intuitions of the soul and in the moral order of the universe. On a doctrine of such vast moment and universal reach, it is grateful to the human mind to find a general correspondency between the revelation of God in his word and his teaching through the inward suggestions of our own nature as well as through outward signs.

The question then stands, "What are the natural and moral grounds of our hope and belief of a future, endless life?"

A class of arguments for the immortality of the soul is known as the *metaphysical proof*, and consists in inferences from the supposed substance of the soul and its natural phenomena. It is common to urge from these sources a natural and necessary immortality. The usual course of reasoning has been, "The soul is indivisible, it can not therefore be dissolved." What we call death is a dissolution; the soul, therefore, cannot die. It is *necessarily* immortal. "The soul is immaterial and, therefore, can not be annihilated by the dissolution of a material body. The soul is of the nature of God—something divine and, therefore, cannot perish." It was on grounds of this kind that all the

ancient philosophers except Socrates made issue. He alone, here as everywhere else standing out prominently from the ancient world, based his argument on moral not on physical grounds. The different schools asserted or denied the immortality of the soul according to their assumed theories of the substance or physical nature of the soul. The Epicurean assumed it to be a congeries of atoms, and therefore dissoluble and mortal. The Pythagorean that it was a monad, a numeric unity, and, therefore, incapable of dissolution and death.

It is evident that reasoning of this kind is unsatisfactory and inconclusive. The substance of the soul does not decide its immortality. Materiality does not preclude, nor immateriality ensure it. The question still rests with God. He alone has *necessary* immortality, and all created beings are or are not immortal as he wills.

Another class of arguments is drawn from a generally admitted doctrine of modern science, the indestructibility of matter and force, and the conclusion it furnishes as to a universal law, as applicable to the spiritual as to the material. * * Science knows nothing of the destruction or even of the deterioration of matter. So far as may be known no atom of matter is ever destroyed or lost. In the burial of ages, the mouldering dust of innumerable dead, in the ravages of oceans, the flow of rivers, the crumbling of mountains, there is nothing lost.

"Nothing is lost ; the drop of dew
That trembles on the leaf or flower
Is but exhaled to fall anew
In summer thunder shower.

The little drift of common dust
By the March winds disturbed and tost
Though scattered by the fitful gust
Is changed but never lost."

And so force, energy, motion, changed in one form, perpetually re-appears in another.

As mind is superior to matter and possesses energy as an inherent attribute, it is inferred that it must come surely under this law of indestructibility and can never perish. In the destruction of a thinking, moral being there would be an absolute

destruction. It would not be like the setting of the sun, which is but the transfer of light to new regions, but rather a quenching of the light. It would be a ruin such as nature nowhere else exhibits, a ruin of what is infinitely more precious than the material universe, and is not to be inferred from any of the changes of the outward world.

It has been truly said "that from time immemorial reason has set up her array of proofs for the immortality of the soul." It was a tenet taught by all the ancient systems of religion, Egyptian, Assyrian, Persian, Hindoo, Grecian and Roman. Whether this is to be regarded as a relic of an early divine revelation handed down by tradition from generation to generation, or whether we are to regard it as the triumph of unassisted reason,—in either case it seems to say to us,—the scripture must indeed be true which tells us that God created man in his own image; the image of his intelligence, the likeness of his reason and of his reflection. This historic evidence of the wide prevalence of the doctrine among all nations shows how deeply seated is the hope in human hearts.

After a due consideration of the arguments that have just been detailed, whatever probable intimations they furnish of the doctrine of immortality, they can give us only hints and probabilities. They leave the longing soul far short of gladdening assurance. The argument which alone gives us certainty must be one that *finds its grounds of belief in God*. That "in him we live, move, and have being," will be as true millions of ages hence, as at this moment. The whole question is, What is God's will? Can we extract an answer clear and sure from his breast, in whom dwells the mighty secret, by the key of Nature? This is the problem now to be solved.

We have certain primary beliefs and feelings which we are compelled to act on, and the contradiction of which makes our whole nature and being a falsehood, and loses us the present as well as the future life. The truthfulness of our intellectual and moral intuitions is a principle universally and necessarily admitted in all reasoning.

What, then, is the testimony which the consciousness of the

soul compels it to make from itself to its God. His will as to our future being, how shall we learn that? God speaks by the constitution of the nature he has given us, by the laws of intellectual and moral belief he has ordained. What he thus utters could not have his veracity pledged more certainly if it were written by lightnings, or pealed forth in the thunders of heaven. It is in this way he has promised a future life to the soul of man through the revelation of himself to the human consciousness. "As God, through the laws of belief he has established within me, assures me through my own existence of his being and power, and by the same constitution of my nature, tells me he is reasonable, benevolent, just and true, all these attributes are a declaration of his will that the soul shall be immortal." The denial of the soul's immortality must involve the denial of the attributes of reasonableness, and justice, and benevolence of the Deity, and so contradict the primary laws of belief and the moral intuitions of the human soul. It must, therefore, be absurd and false.

It is a law of our mental and moral natures to expect and require order and congruity in the universe,—a *correspondence of ends to means*,—and so to demand an adequate end for the human soul. There can not be a reasonable universe of which man is a part, which does not provide for the perfect development of all his capacities. That development involves his personal immortality. The capacities of the soul look up into the mighty future for their full development. If death be the commencement of an eternal sleep, for what end was man made thus gifted and godlike? Why these great powers for nothing? This advance on thought and character for no end beyond? Man's end surely is not reached in this life. Every human life is like an unfinished tale in a magazine with "to be continued" written at its close, to show that it is not ended. The human soul contains within itself prophecies of its immortality. The wings of a bird before it leaves its shell are a prediction of a higher life. Vast forces are slumbering in our bosom, unseen, unfelt, till the springs of action are touched and their concealed glories come forth as the sublime regalia of man's intellectual

and moral nature. Is it the fitting end of a wondrous piece of mechanism to be dashed in pieces, just as, with much expense and pains, it has been constructed? But such a mechanism we may consider the soul of man at death. Life is to it but the period of discipline and accumulation of power for future action and enjoyment. At death it still demands an *end*. And is there no end beyond this life? Are powers accumulated only to be destroyed? Virtues disciplined for annihilation? Capacities for active service and enjoyment expanded for eternal blasting? Surely if the soul is mortal almighty unreason sits on the throne of the universe! But such a conclusion the soul feels, yes, *knows* to be absurd. From the harmonies of the universe, the chain of correspondencies binding all being; from the depths of its own nature it cries out an indignant,—“It can not be!”

This conviction of a future endless life becomes still stronger as we study the manifest *incompleteness of present good in the light of God our Creator: benevolence*. Here and now happiness is at best but partial and often deeply marred. Our earthly lives bring with them many blessings and open many sources of enjoyment. And yet none are without experiences of sorrow and disappointment. Why do we find that in this life the soul can never find a perfect or satisfying good? Why do we see virtue often walking in this world under a cloud—her path one of pain and darkness and tears? Is it urged that this is the discipline of a loving Father? Discipline for what? To what? Annihilation? or, to a life where “these light afflictions, which are for a moment, shall work out a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory?” A benevolent God utters in our ears but one answer. In assuring us that he delights in the happiness of his creatures, he has assured us of another life, where true believers shall find a bliss without alloy and without end. The longing desire of every soul for happiness complete and perpetual asks for a future life, or the present life would be a mockery and a tragic sport.

That God wills the soul's immortality because he is love our moral sense infers from the incompleteness of man's present development with reference to God, even in his best moral state

in this life. * * Man is plainly made as if there were a God who made him, and made him for that God. The belief in God is a necessity of human thought. There is an element in the soul of man, or rather a combination of elements, religious capacities and wants that ever tend upward. Man is a creature, who having a Creator, finds his true sphere and destiny, when he finds and worships God.

And yet how difficult here and now is this problem of God either with or without revelation. How mysteriously distant the Being who is yet so near! The heavens move in silence and we see their motion, but we see not the God that moves them. If we pray, he responds not in any audible voice. Communion with him, though ever so real, must cross a great gulf. And is this to be our permanent state? Shall we never rise above the visions of time? Is the experience of the holiest saint the best that is possible to man? Religion, as a glowing, living fact in the soul, is even now and here a superlative good as compared with every other good of earth, and yet it seems but a drop taken from a boundless sea. The God who now invites our thought and love and worship, who admits us to a partial worship; does he purpose no more? As a privilege, a foretaste, a discipline, a preparation, religion in the soul of man is a grand fact, but it wants a future life to consummate it. Immortality is needed to expound and perfect it. God's love to man gives assurance that there will be hereafter an immortal life where there shall be a full unfolding and development of the new, spiritual, holy nature begotten in this life by the Spirit of God.

Our moral sense compels us to believe that God is just and that the order of a just Providence is to make it well with the righteous and ill with the wicked, distributing rewards and punishments for actions done according to their moral quality. This law we see is not fully executed in time, vice is often in triumph and virtue in distress; the good man laden with heavy woes and the bad man sitting at his ease; the Christian martyr burning at the stake and the profligate sinner in luxurious indulgence, defying God,—this plainly is not a perfect ex-

emplification of moral Providence. If there be a God who made the world, and if he be a moral Being, then something more remains: some sequel in the future follows the close of the present life: some righting of what now seems partial and incomplete is and must be the business of eternity. The voice of God within us assures us that there is another life where retribution shall overtake impenitent guilt, and happiness and honor crown suffering virtue.

The irrepressible feelings and intuitive inferences which arise in our minds from a view of the above facts compel us to believe in the immortality of the soul. And this belief is inseparably associated with our belief that God is *true*. He has so made us that we necessarily infer an hereafter because he is reasonable, good and just. His truth forbids the blasphemous supposition that, by the laws of belief he has impressed on our minds, we should believe a lie. Moral intuition no more admits of question than intellectual. The law that like causes produce like effects holds as well in regard to moral as to physical causes. Feeling and beliefs flowing from our original constitution are the voice of our Creator and must be regarded as, like their source, infallibly true.

The grounds on which all valid arguments from nature on this subject must rest show the necessity of a special Revelation for the complete establishment of the doctrine of man's immortality. The argument from nature being founded on a true idea of God in a world where that idea has been clouded and darkened a new Revelation of him becomes an absolute need. One was needed to come from heaven to be both the revealer of God, and the bringer of "Life and Immortality to light." One mightier than death, in whom are hid all treasures of wisdom and grace, has come to show us the Father, to be the living witness of a life to come. Of a future existence "God hath now given assurance to all men in that he raised Jesus Christ from the dead." Human nature looks up to her Redeemer and receives from him the boon of eternal life, the purchase and the triumph of his mighty agony and death!

ARTICLE II.

THE LORD'S SUPPER.

[THE HOLMAN LECTURE ON THE AUGSBURG CONFESSION, DELIVERED IN THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, GETTYSBURG, PA., JUNE 2, 1897.]

BY REV. FRANK P. MANHART, A. M.

Article X of our Confession reads as follows: *De Coena Domini docent, quod corpus et sanguis Christi vere adsint, et distribuantur vescentibus in Coena Domini; et improbant secus docentes.*

Melanchthon's edition of 1540 reads: *De Coena Domini docent, quod cum pane et vino vere exhibeantur corpus et sanguis Christi vescentibus in Coena Domini.*

The German text is: *Vom Abendmahl des Herrn wird also gelehret, dass wahrer Leib und Blut Christi wahrhaftiglich unter Gestalt des Brots and Weins im Abendmahl gegenwärtig sei, und da ausgetheilt und genommen wird. Denhalben wird auch die Gegenlehr verworfen.*

The Apology says: *Confitemur, nos sentire, quod in Coena Domini vere et substantialiter adsint corpus et sanguis Christi et vere exhibeantur cum illis rebus, quae videntur, pane et vino, his, qui sacramentum accipiunt.*

The English translation of Article X with the modifying terms from the German reads: *Of the Supper of the Lord they teach that the (true) body and blood of Christ are truly present (under the form of bread and wine) and are (there) communicated to those that eat in the Lord's Supper (and received). And they disapprove of those that teach otherwise (wherefore also the opposite doctrine is rejected).*

The irenic purpose in view in the preparation of the Augsburg Confession did not call for an extended statement of each doctrine. The Tenth Article states the Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's Supper with sufficient fullness to prove that the Lu-

theran Churches held to a doctrine of the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist harmonious with the Scriptures, the Early Church, and even with the Roman Church so far as that could be judged by the writings of the Fathers. (Epilogue to the Doctrinal Articles).

A lectureship, like that so generously founded by that stalwart Lutheran theologian, Rev. Dr. Holman, naturally calls for historic studies and amplified restatements of the teachings of the doctrines of the Augustana.

In treating the article *De Coena Domini*, it seems specially fitting to approach it, by a survey of the salient lines along which Luther and Melanchthon apprehended and developed the doctrine rather than by a study of the doctrine as stated afterward in the dogmatics of orthodox Lutheran theologians.*

The Augsburg Confession is the joint work of both Luther and Melanchthon. While it is true, on the one hand, that Luther was the spiritual father of Melanchthon, and that, as early as 1518, Luther had a firm grasp of the fundamental ideas of his complete theological system: yet it is also true, that from 1518 to 1530, Luther and Melanchthon were constant companions, and their theological development went forward with a common pace.

Melanchthon had the genius of the investigator, the scholar, and the teacher. In acquirements, in disposition, in congenial activity, he was "at home" in a university; and, beyond any other, was himself the living embodiment of an ideal university.

The first twelve years of their friendship were remarkable,

*In some parts of the lecture it would be a satisfaction to refer at times more directly to the original sources of information. As free use was made of expressions and quotations collected at various times it has not been practical to do this. This is specially regretted in the case of Occam. Some of his works only are in print, (one edition at Strasburg, 1496). While some of his philosophical works were used directly, it is believed that there is no copy of his tractate *De Sacramento* in America. The extracts are doubtless reliable though they come directly from collected notes. In the section referring to the Zwinglian party free use was made of advance sheets of Vol. II, of Köstlin's *Luther's Theology* as translated by Rev. C. E. Hay, D. D. The New Market translation of the *Grosses Bekenntniss vom Abendmahl* of 1528 was also used.

equally for the amount and the character of those labors, which changed the face of civilization.

So far as Luther is concerned, there was, after 1530, no material increase of ideas or gain in the power of expressing them.*

Up to that date, and probably also ever afterward, Luther and Melanchthon were an absolute unity in the faith, confessed in Article X of the Augsburg Confession.†

Luther brought to his task the highest and most forceful genius ever given to a man; so that, under God, he could touch life with epoch-making power at a score of points, and then become the personal source of all subsequent progressive civilization and history.‡

*Well known extreme statements of Luther have been purposely omitted. A man of as ardent a temperament as Luther's and so pressed with labors, difficulties and enemies, and engaged so often in bitter controversies, inevitably makes some statements that pass beyond the general trend of his thought; and which, in the system resultant from his teaching are therefore wisely and even necessarily ignored. Besides, with its irenic purpose the Augustana presented nothing in extreme form. Only thus could it have become the œcumenical symbol of œcumenical Lutheranism, that it undoubtedly is. Furthermore Melanchthon, and not Luther, wrote the Confession, and the Confession is extreme in nothing historical and Scriptural.

†In the absence of testimony, save from non-Lutherans or those who in their zeal for Lutheranism lacked the breadth and fairness of Luther, we must take Melanchthon at his word when he says that he never departed from the faith of Luther. cf. Jacobs on Melanchthon in *Lutheran* of Feb. 19, 1897.

In the Saxon Confession (1551) which Melanchthon called a "Repetition and Exposition of the Augsburg Confession," he is clear and firm in maintaining the Lutheran view of the Eucharist.

‡Carlyle's rugged and forceful statements of the philosophy of modern history appears in his *Heroes and Hero Worship*. "The Diet of Worms, Luther's appearance there on the 17th of April 1521, may be considered as the greatest scene in Modern European History; the point, indeed, from which the whole subsequent history of civilization takes its rise.

* * * * *

It is, as we say, the greatest moment in the Modern History of Men. English Puritanism, England and its Parliaments, Americas and vast work these two centuries; French Revolution, Europe and its work everywhere at present: the germ of it all lay there: had Luther in that moment done other, it had all been otherwise!"

The Augsburg Confession, therefore, is the joint product of a spiritual and intellectual father and son, each unique in personal genius, while in complementary development and labors they were more than brothers.*

The chief human source of the content of the Confession was Luther, while Melanchthon was the responsible author of its order, and was its only direct composer.†

The doing of a work of enduring import among men presupposes an adequate and markedly providential preparation. Such a work is the Augsburg Confession, and such an adequate preparation was that of Luther and Melanchthon.

As our immediate concern is with the article treating of the Lord's Supper, we are directly concerned only with those ideas of philosophy, dogmatic and ecclesiastical theology, and Christian life, which had for them attractive, repulsive, or formative power.

Melanchthon, like Augustine, was a Platonist. He had, moreover, a scholar's thorough knowledge of ancient and medieval philosophy.

Luther was, for some years, a professor of philosophy at Wittenberg and lectured on Aristotle. His intellectual affinities,

*"Luther was much confirmed in his new convictions, by Melanchthon, who had independently by calm study arrived at the same conclusions. In the controversy with Eck, August, 1519, Melanchthon laid down the far-reaching principle that the Scriptures are the supreme rule of faith, and that we must not explain the Scriptures by the Fathers, but explain and judge the Fathers by the Scriptures. He discovered that even Ambrose, Jerome and Augustine had often erred in their exegesis. A little later (Sept. 1519), he raised the same charge against the councils, and maintained that a Catholic Christian could not be required to believe any thing that was not warranted by the Scriptures. He expressed doubts about transubstantiation and the whole fabric of the mass. His estimate of the supreme value of the Scriptures, especially of Paul, rose higher and higher and made him stronger and bolder in the conflict with medieval tradition.

Thus fortified by the learning of Melanchthon, etc., etc." Schaff, *History of the Christian Church*, Vol. VI, p. 204, also pp. 191 et seq.

†Melanchthon, of course, kept well in mind the Articles of Marburg, Schwabach, and Torgau, and the suggestions of his immediate associates at Augsburg; but the work composition was preëminently his.

however, were with Plato rather than with Aristotle. Luther came to know Plato mainly through the Fathers; who, like Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Clemens Alexandrinus, Origen, Basil, Eusebius, Gregory of Nyssa, and Augustine, were more or less Platonic; and through Medieval Mysticism, which on its philosophical side was Platonic, being thus the counterpart of scholasticism, which was largely Aristotelian. Luther was a complete master of the ideas and subtleties of every variety of Medieval Scholasticism.*

On the intellectual side, Luther's special teachers were:

1. Aristotle: the encyclopedist of antiquity, founder of logic and ontology, and through but part of his writings the master-spirit of the medieval world for four centuries. His grammar, analysis, logic, metaphysics, dialectics and rhetoric—his method being more important than his content—were the instruments by which revealed truth was to be systematized and defended, and all unrevealed truth discovered.†

2. Plato: idealist, mystic, poet, synthesist, whose philosophical dreams seemed to the Fathers to have wonderful affinities with the truths revealed in Christ; whose highest-good, or God was "love"; like Aristotle, student of man as a social being, exponent of Greek Theism, teleology, and the soul's immortality; differing from Aristotle, his great pupil, rather in method than in content.

3. Scholastics. While they all were Luther's teachers yet the subtlest among them, the English William of Occam [†1347], was such pre-eminently. He was a Nominalist, op-

*If the Scholastics deserved such high-flown titles as "doctor angelicus (Aquinas), seraphicus (Bonaventura), subtilissimus, (Duna Scotus), Christianissimus (Gerson), invincibilis (Occam.), etc., then Luther deserved them all, for in logical vigor, dialectical skill, profundity of thought, biblical knowledge, spiritual insight, height and depth of religious experience, he excelled all schoolmen, mystics and saints of the mediæval period. He knew D'Ailly and Biel "almost by heart," says Melancthon, and preferred them and Occam to Aquinas and Scotus.

†Luther's occasional savage denunciations of Aristotle were occasioned by the use made by scholastics of his "method" to defend and enforce corrupt Roman doctrine.

ponent of transubstantiation; bold enough to challenge the Church's authority in both state and spiritual affairs, and to appeal to a General Council; inventor of many terms which Luther found useful in setting forth his philosophical and theological conceptions of the person of Christ and of the Lord's Supper, he remained for Luther "the chief and most highly gifted of all the scholastic doctors."

4. Humanists. The humanists made Luther a classical scholar. The spirit of Luther was above all else religious. For a time, humanists could be his teachers to direct him to, and fit him for, higher things, while they remained on the lower plain of refined and elegant paganism. Humanist and Luther! How different in spirit! The one of the world, the other of Christ. Yet, how needful the humanist in the making of our Luther. The Alpine climber must needs have a staff.

The influence of Mysticism on Luther and his doctrine must be kept in mind. If one may speak positively of so elusive a thing, it may be said that Luther was a thorough master of mysticism. This can only be said of one who is much of mystic himself. Such was Luther. But there are mystics and mystics. He was of that class who never lose their sober selves in their intense desire for, or consciousness of, communion with God.

Medieval Mysticism, being rooted in Neo-Platonism, was the natural counterpart of Scholasticism which was rooted in Aristotelianism.

Its affinities are with John rather than with Paul, though Paul too has mystic elements. John's logos-doctrine, his exaltation of love, his personal traits; all mean far more to the mystic than the logical, discursive, doctrinal, yet withal intensely active, practical, spiritual teachings of Paul. On its extravagant side, mysticism is accountable for Gnosticism, the Pseudo-Dionysius, many of the wild fantasies and sects of the Middle Ages, and for the Anabaptists and "Heavenly Prophets" of the Reformation era.*

*"The German mysticism of the Middle Ages was animated by an aspiration which points in the direction of a true religious experience of the

Mediaeval Mysticism is directly related to the Pseudo Dyonisius as translated by John Scotus Erigena, c. 850.* It was throughout the subjective side of Scholasticism."

On its sober side it produced some of the greatest characters and works of the Middle Ages. Many of the scholastics were mystics as well. To it we owe many of the great medieval hymns†—as yet unsurpassed in their fields—the Imitation of Christ, the sermons of Tauler, the *Theologia Germanica* and much of the devoutness, fraternity and charity of the Middle Ages.

Every phase of mysticism as previously developed was understood by Luther. Much as he was influenced and enriched by it,—and he was all his life a mystic—he was never unbalanced by it. Though he often felt that he was directly conscious of God, and had direct communion with him, yet he never once fancied himself above the Church with her word and sacraments and her providential historical development, or lost himself in the rapt desire of ecstatic mysticism to be "drunk with God." To him, life was a believing, divinely directed service rather than "sanctified" languor or rapt, ecstatic contemplation and transport.

Mysticism is a part of all true religion. It is a vital part of Christianity. It has clear affinities with the Lutheran view of the Lord's Supper. A full-orbed man with Christian experiences like Luther, could not but recognize the mystic elements in the Eucharist. A rationalist like Zwingli, and a legal-theologico logician like Calvin and the systems they originated, necessarily have but a meagre appreciation of the mystic elements in Christian ordinances, truth, and life.

'indwelling of God,' the aspiration was rather that of a creature seeking communion with his Creator, than that of a sinner seeking reconciliation with his righteous God and Judge." *British Quarterly*, 1872, p. 25.

*His works "wrought like a spell upon the mediaeval church, especially upon the mystics of the twelfth century. * * * The *φύνη μόνου προς μόνον* of Plotinus expresses the inmost heart of Mysticism." Farrar, *History of Interpretation*, p. 255.

†They hymn Christ with mystic love and devotion. The great hymns on heaven are surcharged with mystic longing—home-sickness for heaven.

Luther and Melanchthon had an adequate knowledge of the opinions held upon the Lord's Supper throughout the whole range of Christian history.* They found that the Fathers held well nigh universally, though not always with consistency and never in complete theological definition and system, an actual objective and bodily presence of Christ in the Eucharist.†

The occasional use, by some Fathers, of such terms as: *transitio*, *transmutatio*, *convertio substantiae*, and *μεταβολή*; are, at least, suggestive of transubstantiation; though the one thing to be said with assurance about the Fathers is, that they taught a real and bodily presence of Christ in the Eucharist.‡

*Luther and Melanchthon and others make further and ample collections of the pertinent passages in the Fathers in 1525.

†Typical quotations from the Fathers:

Ignatius. The Eucharist is the flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ, which suffered for our sins, and which the Father of his goodness raised up again. Ante-Nic. Fathers, Vol. I, p. 89.

Justin Martyr. And this food is called among us *Εὐχαρίστια*, of which no one is allowed to partake but the man who believes that the things which we teach are true, and who has been washed with the washing that is for the remission of sins, and unto regeneration, and who is so living as Christ has enjoined. For not as common bread and common drink do we receive these; but in like manner as Jesus Christ our Saviour, having been made flesh by the word of God, had both flesh and blood for our salvation, so likewise have we been taught that the food which is blessed by the prayer of his word, and from which our blood and flesh by transmutation are nourished, is the flesh and blood of that Jesus who was made flesh. Ante-Nicene Fathers, Vol. I, p. 185. The Scotch editors say: "This passage is claimed alike by Calvinists, Lutherans and Romanists."

Irenaeus. "If the body were not also to be saved, for what purpose should it then be fed with the body and blood of the Lord in the sacrament?" Quoted by Luther, K. 2: 126, cf. Ante-Nicene Fathers, Vol. I, 527-8.

Gelasius Bp. of Rome 490. By the sacraments we are made partakers of the divine nature, and yet the substance and nature of bread and wine do not cease to be in them. Ante-Nicene Fathers, Vol. I, p. 185.

‡The selections of Pusey from the Fathers abundantly prove this; even though they are made after the manner of a special pleader rather of an impartial scholar. Cf. Lias's, Nicene Creed, Neander, Hagenbach, Early Christian Liturgies and the Ante-Nicene, Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers in loco.

Paschasius Radbertus in the ninth century and Lanfranc in the eleventh, taught the doctrine of transubstantiation. In this they were followed by most of the Scholastics. The doctrine was approved by the fourth Lateran Council (1215), held under Innocent III, in the following terms, in which the word *consubstantiation* appears to have been first authoritatively used: "Una vero est fidelium universalis ecclesia, extra quam omnino salvatur, in qua idem ipse sacerdos et sacrificium Jesus Christus, cujus corpus et sanguis in sacramento altaris sub speciebus panis et vini veraciter continentur, *transubstantiatis* pane in corpus et vino in sanguinem, potestate divina, ut ad perficiendum mysterium unitatis accipiamus ipsi de suo, quod accepit ipse de nostro. Et hoc utique sacramentum nemo potest conficere, nisi sacerdos, qui fuerit rite ordinatus secundum claves ecclesiae, quas ipse concessit apostolis et eorum successoribus Jesus Christus.*

The Roman Catholic Church, 236 years later, in setting forth her distinctive creed as a section of Christendom, taught transubstantiation as follows: And because that Christ, our Redeemer, declared that which he offered under the species of bread to be truly his own body, therefore has it ever been a firm belief in the Church of God, and this holy Synod doth declare it anew, that, by the consecration of the bread and the wine, a conversion is made of the whole substance of the bread into the substance of the body of Christ our Lord, and of the whole substance of the wine into the substance of his blood; which conversion is, by the holy Catholic Church, suitably and properly called Transubstantiation.†

Transubstantiation requires belief in such magical transformations of the bread and wine, as deceive the senses of sight, taste, touch and smell; in the performance of numberless miracles by priests, in that they repeat the sacrifice of Christ for sin at every mass, and in an exegesis baldly and crudely literal.‡

*Hefele, Vol. V, 879.

†Decree of Tridentine Council, Oct. 11, 1551, Schaff's Creeds of Christendom, Vol. II, 130.

‡The acceptance of transubstantiation as theoretically true, naturally led to the denial of the cup to the laity through a sense of awe, the doc-

Between the Lateran Council (1215) and the Reformation, opposition to it appeared in various quarters. John of Paris, Durandus, Wickliffe, Jerome of Prague, John Wessel and Occam, may be mentioned. Of these Occam and Durandus are of special interest to us because of similarities to Luther and Melancthon.*

The relation of Luther to Occam is so important as to call for a special consideration.

Occam was Regius Prof. of theology and intellectual head of the University of Paris; exponent of the Byzantine logic; restorer of Nominalism; of a questioning, critical and free if not of a skeptical spirit; author of the reply to Boniface's *Unam Sanctam*; accepted as a dogma whatever the Church said was revealed, yet, withal, refusing to be bound by Pope or Council; theorizing with the utmost subtlety and daring about all theological questions; a great student of the Bible; a mystic; a Franciscan monk; a devout and ascetic imitator of Christ after a monkish fashion; a product of the Middle Ages, an embodiment of much of its intellect and heart, yet a mighty force in its destruction.†

This Occam, who was scholastic, mystic, orthodox in dogma, untrammelled in speculation, sapper of papal authority in state and church, ascetic monk, excommunicated, advance promoter of a new era with whose inner life he could have no kinship, yet meant more than any other scholastic to Luther and to his satisfactory and complete presentation of the doctrine of the eucharist. Luther refers to him "mein Meister Occam" and "mein

trine of concomitance, to the adoration of the host, (thirteenth century), the legends of the host bleeding its appearance in the form of a lamb, its causing the death of animals, etc.

*"None of the scholastics entertained views more nearly allied to those of Luther than Durandus." Cramer in Hagenbach, Vol. II, 360. Rupert of Deutz, [† 1135] held to a "wonderful union of Christ's body with the bread, but without any disturbance of the sensible elements." He called the bread, very expressively, *Dei fer panis*. Hagenbach.

†His offer to the Emperor Lewis of Bavaria in his contest with the Pope was: "Tu me defende gladio, ego te defendam calamo." "In his *Epistola Defensoria* he became the earliest defender of the liberty of the Press."

lieber Meister Occam." In such important works as the Babylonian Captivity and the Grosses Bekenntniss vom Abendmahl, he refers to him and uses him freely. Melancthon says that Luther, "Gabrielem et Cameracensum [Biel and D'Ailly] pene ad verbum memoriter recitare poterat. Diu multum legit scripta Occam, huius acumen anteferebat Thomae et Scotae." *

The following teachings of Occam as found in his *De Sacramento Altaris*, were directly copied and used by Luther in his controversies with Zwingli and Ecolampadius.

In his "dogma" of the eucharist Occam said the "accidents" remained while the "substance" disappeared. Luther agreed with the former but not the latter.

Occam held to a local or "circumscriptive," to an illocal or "definitive" and to a majestic or divine mode of presence. The "definitive" specially explains the presence of Christ in the eucharist.

"The soul is in the body 'definitive.' It is in the body, and the whole of it is in every part of it." "The co-existence of the body of Christ with the closed doors are examples of the same co-existence of two substances in one place."

"Christ's body is present in, with and under, the species of bread and wine. Each [the body of Christ and the bread] is distinct, *i. e.* moving the host did not move the body. Moving the body did not necessarily move the host, that depended upon the will of Christ, who was conscious of his bodily presence in the host, and willed that his body should move as the host did."

Occam's language is: *Dico quod esse in loco accipitur dupliciter, scilicet circumscriptive et definitive. Circumscriptive in loco est aliquid in loco, cujus pars est in parte loci et totum in toto loco; definitive autem esse in loco est, quando totum est in toto loco, et non extra, et totum est in qualibet parte illius loci.*

Ita enim tenemus, quod anima intellectiva est tota in toto corpore, et qualibet parte ejus, nec oppositum potest per rationem demonstrativam probari. Sic etiam tenemus quod angelus est totus in aliquo loco definitive et in qualibet parte; per idem non

*Vita Lutheri Vitenberg, 1549.

debet etiam aliquis negare, quin per divinam potentiam possint duo corpora, tam ejusdem specei speciallissimae, quam diversae, simul eidem loco coexistere. Sic enim Salvator Jesus Christus clausis januis intravit ad discipulos, et clauso utero virginis exivit in mundum, et nullo diviso corpore celesti in coelum ascendit.

Occam taught the ubiquity of Christ's body. "The real theory of Occam was, that the body of Christ is contained in the host, in the same manner in which soul and body together occupy one and the same space."*

The specific development of Luther's doctrine of the Eucharist may be said to extend from 1515 to 1530. Some early sermons, the Babylonian Captivity, Letters to the Bohemians, the Saxon Articles of Melanchthon approved by him, his controversies with the "Sacramentarians," his writings to the "Mediators" Bucer, Hedio *et al.*, his Grosses Bekenntniss vom Abendmahl 1528, the Catechisms of 1529, the meetings with their resultant Articles at Marburg, Schwabach and Torgau, the Augsburg Confession of 1530, indicate in part his theological and literary activity and his steady progress towards a ripe and complete consistency.

Early in this period he finally rejected transubstantiation.† His conservatism in holding fast to the general historical consensus of opinion in Christendom in favor of a real presence, while repudiating transubstantiation as a corruption, did not satisfy the extreme and fanatical spirits that arose at the heels of the Reformation. Honius, Carlstadt, the "Heavenly Prophets," and Zwingli, were alike in this, that they found Luther not "evangelical" and "spiritual" enough for them, and at least measurably justify Luther in classing them together.

Luther developed his doctrine, in harmony with what he be-

*Rettberg cited by Hagenbach, cf. Rettberg on Luther and Occam in *Studien und Kritiken*, 1839, and Occam and the Reformation in *British Quarterly Review*, Vol. 58.

†In the Babylonian Captivity (1520) Luther combats the doctrine of Transubstantiation, in a way that shows him an easy vanquisher of the subtleties of Aquinas and all its other scholastic defenders.

lieved to be the teachings of the word of God and the consensus of the Fathers, avoiding on the one side the extreme of transubstantiation and on the other the extremes of Carlstadt and the "Prophets," of Honius and Zwingli. His treatment of the mediating party of Bucer, shows how broad and conciliatory he was when not asked to give up what was to him the truth of God's word.

His position in regard to the Church, in its historic continuity and life under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, is shown in the following sentiment: "That it is very dangerous to infer that Christendom was through so many centuries without a true understanding of the sacrament, inasmuch as we all acknowledge that the sacraments and the Word, although covered over with many abominable practices, have nevertheless been preserved."

Luther's *Grosses Bekenntniss vom Abendmahl Christi*, 1528, in which he refutes Zwingli's "figurative interpretation of the words of institution and his Christology, more thoroughly, keenly and absolutely than elsewhere" (Kœstlin), marks his maturity; though later he relied, for his doctrine of the Eucharist, more completely upon his direct exegesis and so somewhat less upon his Christology.

Several features of the Zwinglian view here combatted by Luther will be noticed.*

*Zwingli prepared a statement of his doctrines to present at Augsburg, 1530, but was not allowed to do so. He called it, *Fidei Ratio*. A brief quotation will suffice to show his spirit. "I believe, yea I know, that all the sacraments are so far from conferring grace that they do not even convey or distribute it. Sec. 7.

I believe that in the holy Eucharist—*i. e.* the supper of thanksgiving—the true body of Christ is present by the contemplation of faith; *i. e.* that they who thank the Lord for the kindness conferred on us in his Son acknowledge that he assumed true flesh, in it truly suffered, truly washed away our sin in his own blood; and thus everything done by Christ becomes present to them by the contemplation of faith. But that the body of Christ in essence and really—*i. e.* the natural body itself—is either present in the Supper or masticated with our mouth and teeth, as the Papists and some who long for the flesh-pots of Egypt assert, we not only deny, but firmly maintain is an error opposed to God's word. This, with the divine assistance, I will in a few words, O Emperor, make as clear as

1. In Zwingli's exegesis, *is* was equivalent to signifies. Luther's rule of interpretation was: "In the Scripture, we should allow the words to retain their natural force, as they read, according to the style, and assign no other signification to them, unless required by an evident article of faith."* He rightly doubted whether the usage of "any language on earth" justified the Zwinglian position.†

2. To the view that the words, "This is my body," were figurative, and intended merely to suggest devout meditation upon

the sun. First, by citing the divine oracles; secondly, by attacking the adversaries with arguments derived therefrom, as with military engines; lastly, by showing that the ancient theologians held our opinion." Section

8. Jacobs, Book of Concord. "The easiest way of explaining is to say it is a figure of speech; but this explanation explains nothing." Delitzsch on Ps. 148.

*Luther on the Sacraments, New Market, p. 287.

†The following additional quotations from Luther more fully exhibit his exegetical principles:

"The literal sense of Scripture alone is the whole essence of faith and of Christian theology."

"I have observed this, that all heresies and errors have originated, not from the simple words of Scripture, as is so universally asserted, but from neglecting the simple words of Scripture, and from the affectation of purely subjective tropes and inferences."

"The science of theology is nothing else than grammar applied to the words of the Holy Spirit."

"He insists (1) on the necessity for grammatical knowledge; (2) on the importance of taking into consideration times, circumstances and conditions; (3) on the observance of the context; (4) on the need of faith and spiritual illumination; (5) on keeping the 'proportion of faith' and (6) on the reference of all Scripture to Christ." Quoted by Farrar in History of Interpretation.

Most of these principles he applied in the controversy with the Zwinglians. It was hard for him to believe in the orthodoxy and sincerity of Zwingli. He seemed a trifle to Luther and to Melanchthon. Certainly no Herder will ever say of him, as of Luther: "The man took everything so largely and heartily, * * The whole man ever feeling the word of God, whose speech is always the word of God, and the state of the Church, who feels all things as great serious facts, and contends for them—this is the man who stands before us." Herder, 206, K, 2.

"Melanchthon's most important services as an exegete were philological and theological. He says 'ignavus in grammatica est ignavus in theologia.'" Farrar ut supra.

the death of Christ on the cross, Luther objects that this makes the words of institution unnecessary, as without them Christians would meditate upon his death, and that the words "broken for you," do not refer as much to Christ's suffering upon the cross, as to the distribution in the Eucharist. There is, therefore, neither need of, nor fitness in, the figurative interpretation of Zwingli and Oecolampadius. Their "spiritual" eating and drinking is merely faith.

3. The Zwinglians contended that Christ could not be present in the eucharist and at the same time "sit at the right hand of God."

"Luther here encountered the Zwinglian doctrine of *Allæosis*. If the Scriptures, when speaking of one nature of Christ, employ expressions which really apply only to the other, and, accordingly, without discrimination affirm now of one and now of the other nature the conditions and activities described, this is, in the opinion of Zwingli, a mere form of speech, which he designates *Allæosis*. Thus, as Luther describes the theory, the Scriptures are supposed simply to take the one nature for the other, whilst each of the natures, in reality, yet remains so distinct from the other as to retain only its own characteristic modes of activity. Against this *Allæosis* Luther cannot too earnestly warn. He calls it the devil's mask. He declares that it is an entirely arbitrary invention of Zwingli, without any evidence from Scripture. Its grandmother is the old sorceress, Dame Reason. And he turns at once against it the force of the fundamental interest of Christian faith. When the Scriptures speak of the sufferings of Christ, this is, according to Zwingli, to be understood only of his human nature. But, in this case, Christ accomplishes nothing more by his sufferings than any other mere saint. If only the human nature suffered for us, then is Christ a poor Saviour, and stands in need, indeed, of a Saviour for himself. If the person of Christ is divided, as this accursed *Allæosis* teaches, the whole Christian faith and the salvation of the world are at once swept away. He himself finds the explanation of the fact, that the Scriptures ascribe to the humanity of Christ that which affects the divinity, and the re-

verse, in the actual union (unification) into which the divinity has entered with the humanity in the person of Christ. Divinity and humanity are in Christ one person. The person, Christ, is true God. If Christ now suffer, we may rightly say that the Son of God suffers: that is to say, the one part, the divinity, does not, indeed, suffer; but the person, who is God, suffers in the other part, namely, the humanity. It is as though we should say, "The king's son is wounded," although it is only his leg that is wounded; or, "Absalom is beautiful," although it is only his body that is beautiful. Since body and soul are one person, whatever befalls either the body or the soul, or even the smallest member of the body, is rightly ascribed to the whole person. Just in this way we are to apply to the entire person of Christ, in which divinity and humanity make one person, whatever befalls either part of the person, because the two are but one person. We do not mingle the two natures into one nature. We do not say that divinity is humanity, or that the divine nature is human nature. But we mingle the *two different natures* into one *single person*, and say: God is man; man is God. By means of the *Allaosis*, on the contrary, the person of Christ is divided, as though there were two persons. When, for example, the passages which speak of suffering are applied to the human nature alone, then, since not the nature, but the person, is the subject of the activity or suffering, Christ must be two persons."*

Luther holds, over against Zwingli's *allaosis*:

1. Christ's existence in heaven and his presence in the Eucharist are not contradictory for "the former involves the ubiquity of his body."
2. The right hand of God is everywhere. Jesus Christ is essentially natural, true, complete God and man in One person, unseparated and undivided. Since his humanity has become

*With unremitting industry, and with an acuteness which no opponent of the Lutheran Doctrine was able to deny, Luther criticized the interpretation of the Swiss Reformers, tore to pieces their arguments, and in a masterly way revealed the points of weakness presented, especially in Zwingli's "significat," and in the array of supposed analogous forms of speech. Koestlin's *Luther's Theology*, vol. 2, 133.

one person with God, and so entirely and altogether taken up into God above all creatures that he, as it were, clings to him, it is, therefore, not possible that the God could be anywhere where he would not be man. The two natures are so united with one another that they belong together more intimately than soul and body; and, accordingly, Christ must also be man wherever he is God. But the right hand of God, and Christ, by virtue of his sitting at the right hand of God and by virtue of his own essential divinity, are everywhere. In these declarations Luther again, referring to John 3 : 13, includes also the period of Christ's earthly life.**

3. Luther teaches that by virtue of the union of the divine and human in Christ, "the omnipresence, which belongs in the first instance to the one part, *i. e.*, the divinity, and which is further said, according to the previous section referred to, to belong to the person of Christ with reference to this one part, must have also passed over to the humanity itself. Thus we have found the Christological basis of Luther's doctrine of the Lord's Supper again unfolded in his Confession."—(Köstlin.)

4. Luther holds that "God in order to be at any one place, is by no means bound to a local presence."

He holds to "three modes of being in one place," *i. e.*, locally or circumscriptively, definitively and repletively.

A local, circumscriptive or comprehensive presence is such as

*"He charges upon Zwingli, who denied that the body of Christ is present wherever God is, and thus at the same time in heaven and on earth, that his coarse spirit knows nothing of what it means to "be in heaven," and he appeals to the fact that Christ was then already, according to John 3 : 13, at the same time in heaven. And he expressly adds, that this applies also to the humanity of Christ from the time of his existence in his mother's womb. It was higher and deeper in God than any angel, and hence, also, higher in heaven. According to this, there is left between the states of Christ, as walking upon the earth and exalted in heaven, only the difference, that his humanity in the former state, although then already the above-depicted consequences of its union with the divinity pertained to it, yet, at the same time, revealed itself in external visibility and humble form at one particular place on earth." Köstlin.

can be measured, or covered, as wine and its vessel. "In this way the body of Christ was present when he, walking upon the earth, filled or vacated space equal to the size of his body." In this way, Christ appeared after his resurrection, and may appear when he so desires, and will appear at the Last Day.

"A thing is *present definitively, or in an incomprehensible manner*, when it is at a *certain definite place, which place is corporeal and comprehensible* and has its dimensions in space, its length, breadth and thickness, but when *the said thing is not of itself present in a comprehensible manner*, cannot be measured by the dimensions of the place, and has itself neither length nor breadth."*

This mode specially explains the presence of Christ in the eucharist as has been seen from Occam and Luther's use of him.

Luther holds also to a *repletive, majestic* presence, or omnipresence. "A thing is repletively, or supernaturally, at places when it is at the same time, in its entirety and completeness, at all places, and fills all places, and yet is bounded and comprehended by no place; as God is, in Jer. 23 : 23, said to be a God near at hand, and not afar off, since he fills heaven and earth. Just in this manner must Christ also, (since he must be as man wherever he is as God,) be present everywhere with his humanity, according to this supernatural, divine mode of presence. According to this third mode, all created things are for him yet far more penetrable and more truly present than according to the second. If he can, according to the second mode, be in created things without being measured or comprehended by them, much more is he then wonderfully in them according to the third mode, so that not only do they not measure or comprehend him, but he, on the contrary, has them present before him, measures and comprehends them. We must locate this, his nature, since he is one with God, far—very far—without and beyond all created things, as far as God is without and beyond them, and yet, again, as

*The term "in" as applied to the presence of God does not mean a comprehensible inclusion "like straw in a bag and bread in a basket." On "these subjects it is equivalent to over, beyond, under, through and through, and everywhere." Luther on Sacraments, New Market, p. 235.

deeply in and near all created things as God is within them."*—(Köstlin.)

To say that the presence of Christ in the Eucharist is sacramental is to say that it is unique, and that it cannot be fully illustrated by anything else, otherwise the sacrament itself would be no addition to our means of grace, and would, therefore, be a useless thing. The Chalcedon Christology furnished Occam and Luther an illustration in the co-existence of God and man in the person of Christ; the union of soul and body in man, furnished another. In our day, applied science furnishes one that may possibly prove serviceable. In the communication of electric power, electricity may be said to be in, with and under, the wire; in that the wire remains wire, yet without it, there would not be the presence and the communication of the electricity: just as the bread, though remaining bread, is that without which there could be no sacramental presence of the body of Christ.

The presence of the electricity in the wire is measurably dependent upon the will of man, the presence of the body of Christ in the Eucharist is, however, dependent entirely upon the will of Christ himself. He has made the Eucharist one of the means by which he graciously imparts himself to his own.

The "live wire" is both wire and electricity. It is "wire-electricity," that is, wire and electricity united "invisibly, unconfusedly, unmixedly" and illocally. The sacramental bread is "body-bread," as the sacramental wine is "blood-wine," *i. e.*, by

*"Luther speaks with great contempt of the contracted conception held by his opponents of the divine presence in general. The divinity is, according to their notion, present everywhere in the corporeal, comprehensible manner (*localiter*), just as though God were a sort of great extended something, reaching through all creatures and out beyond them, filling the world and sticking out beyond it like the straw in an over-full straw-sack. In confutation of this, he repeats the declaration that God is not such a stretched-out being, with special dimensions, but a supernatural, inscrutable Being, present entire and complete in every grain of corn, and yet in and above and beyond all created things. *When we speak of the presence of God, the word "in" does not mean a comprehensible inclusion, as in a bag or basket, but it signifies all that we understand by "above, beyond, beneath, through and through again, and everywhere."* Koestlin.

the mighty word and will of Christ and by his Holy Spirit, Christ and the elements are connected, invisibly, unmixedly, illogically, sacramentally, mystically, yet most really, at the will of Christ himself.*

If it be agreed that "is" means signifies, it does not follow that the only thing signified is the absent body of Christ localized in heaven, or the body of Christ once broken on the cross for us. One might take *is*, to be, not the copula of being, as Luther held, but the equivalent of *signifies*, as Honius and Zwingli taught, and still deduce from it the essentials of the Lutheran doctrine of the Eucharist.

In baptism the sacramental use of the visible, material element water, signifies the inner cleansing which is the regeneration wrought by the invisible but actual supernatural presence and power of the Holy Spirit. So in the Eucharist the sacramental use of the visible, material elements would signify the invisible but actual presence of Christ as the food of the soul.†

To say less would be to say that God gives his people a sign but denies them the thing signified, which is the thing of real value and desire. God's way, however, has always been to give his people a sign that they may be the more sure of the reality. Thus the use of the sacrificial lamb under the Old Covenant, was intended to aid his people in apprehending the offering of Christ, *the* Lamb of God, as a sacrifice for sin.

So, after all, unless one agrees to the principle, that to say a passage of the word of God, is figurative, means to make it void of all content, the question is still open as to what is actually meant by the figurative expression.

*Perhaps, however, in speaking thus of wire and electricity, one is in danger of being clubbed with such verbal bludgeons as *con—, sub—, im—, trans—*.

†Zwingli himself agreed to this principle when he signed the Marburg articles with Luther. The ninth treats of baptism as follows: "That Holy Baptism is a sacrament, that has been instituted of God for this faith, and because God's command: 'Go ye, baptize,' Matt. 28 : 19, and God's promise: 'He that believeth,' Mark 16 : 16, is therein, it is not a mere empty sign or symbol among Christians, *but a sign and work of God, wherein our faith is required, through which we are regenerated.*"

With some, to understand a passage "figuratively" or "spiritually" is simply a "process of evaporation, or explaining away." The fact is, the purpose of figures is to make truth more vivid, and forceful, while "to spiritualize is to intensify." The question then is whether it is not more in harmony with the analogy of Scripture to say that the expression: "This signifies my body broken for you," means the body of Christ present, given to, and shared by, the communicants, rather than a mere memorial of a body broken over 1800 years ago and ever since absolutely localized in heaven and which can only be received "spiritually;" that is, can only be thought about in devout meditation and imagination.

In the light of the historic survey presented, assuming that it has been sufficiently ample to justify it, a somewhat succinct statement of the eucharistic doctrine held by the Confessors at Augsburg, may be made. No attempt will be made to make this statement exhaustive.

1. By the Lord's Supper is meant, the celebration by Christians of the eucharistic rite, especially the repetition of the words of institution and the distribution of the bread and wine, according to the command of Christ.

2. The presence asserted is that of the true body and blood of Christ. The Christology upon which this is based is that of the Fathers, of Chalcedon,* and of the New Testament. This

**Council of Chalcedon.* Schaff, *Creeds of Chrs.* II, 62, 63. 451 A. D.

Following the Holy Fathers, we all with one consent teach men to confess one and the same Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, the same perfect in Godhead and also perfect in manhood; truly God and truly man, of a reasonable [rational] soul and body; consubstantial [coessential] with the Father according to the Godhead, and consubstantial with us according to the Manhood; in all things like unto us, without sin; begotten before all ages of the Father according to the Godhead, and in these latter days for us and for our salvation, born of the Virgin Mary, the Mother of God, according to the Manhood; one and the same Christ, Son, Lord, Only-begotten, to be acknowledged in two natures, *inconfusedly, unchangeably, indivisibly, inseparably*; the distinction of natures being by no means taken away by the union, but rather the property of each nature being preserved, and concurring in one Person and one Subsistence, not parted or divided into two persons, but one and the same Son and only-begotten,

Christology was substantially reproduced in the Schwabach Articles: "The Son of God, true God and man, Jesus Christ, *is a single, inseparable person*, who suffered for us men, died, ascended to heaven, sitteth at the right hand of God, Lord over all creation; so that we are not to believe that Jesus Christ suffered for us as the man, or the human nature: but since God and man are not here two persons, but One inseparable person we are to teach that God and man, or the Son of God truly suffered for us." The eucharistic presence is set forth as follows: That here is present in the bread and in the wine the true body and blood of Christ, according to the words: This is my body, this is my blood.—(*Jacobs*, Book of Concord, vol. II.)

3. The cause of this presence is the word and will of Christ. Since Christ is God, his word is omnipotent. As the Holy Spirit is ever in and with the word, the presence may also be said to be caused by him. In the institution of the sacrament and in the nature he gave it, Christ declared his will to be present in it.

4. The nature of the presence is:

(1) Objective. As the sacrament is a gracious institution and gift of Christ to his Church, it could not be otherwise than objective.

(2) Real: Actual, not merely "figurative" or "spiritual."

(3) True. The Christ, himself, as verily present, as his word is potent and true. Not a presence having no other reality than devout imagination or contemplation.

(4) Substantial. Essential. In his very essence—his true nature and being, as the God-man. "God of the substance of the Father, begotten before the worlds: and Man of the substance of his mother, born in the world; Perfect God, and perfect man: One, by taking the manhood into God." One Christ. One person, of two natures in inseparable union. His substantial presence is of his very self.

(5) Corporeal. Bodily. According to Christ's own word: God the Word, the Lord Jesus Christ; as the prophets from the beginning [have declared] concerning him, and the Lord Jesus Christ himself has taught us, and the Creed of the holy Fathers has handed down to us.

This is my body given for you; he is present, to be given and received in the Holy Communion, with the body prepared for him and to which, in unity of person, he is inseparably united, that body being in all essentials identical with the one which was crucified.

(6) Personal. That is, in his own, proper, complete and unique person. The Son of God and the Son of Man, in unity of person: Godhead and humanity in one unique person, our Redeemer, Saviour and Lord, verily present in the Eucharist, to communicate himself to man.

(7) In, with and under, the form (Gestalt) of bread and wine. "Two things are exhibited and received together, the one earthly, that is, bread and wine, and one heavenly, that is, the body and blood of Christ."* Where the bread and wine, the repetition of the words of institution and the distribution and reception are, according to Christ's command, there is the sacrament. Where the sacrament is, the presence of Christ is. Where the sacrament is not, the special sacramental presence of Christ is not. No sacramental bread and wine, no sacramental presence of Christ. With the seen sacramental bread and wine, the unseen, but actual sacramental presence of Christ. A presence, however, no more fixed or localized than that of electricity in the wire, which it uses as the agent of its presence and the vehicle of its power.

(8) Mystical. *Not magical.* Not apparent to the senses, nor discoverable by the methods of science or the processes of the reason, yet real in itself and realizable to the mind and spirit, through assurance of faith and personal experience.

(9) Supernatural. Christianity is supernatural. Any communication of Christian grace is supernatural. If the Lord's Supper be a sacrament, it must offer and convey special grace. This can only be done by a particular divine presence with its associated exercise of divine power. God in Christ is specially, that is, supernaturally present to convey, and to be himself, the grace of this sacrament.

*The Saxon *Confession*, thus "adapts Irenaeus' language." Lias, p. 323.

NEGATIVE.

A. The presence is not :

(1) Local, that is, circumscriptive, comprehensive, or such as occupies measurable space.

(2) By *Impanation and Invination* ; that is, any local, "spatial," physical or measurable inclusion, particle by particle or otherwise, of any part of the body and blood of Christ physically within the bread and wine.*

(3) By *Consubstantiation* (*Συνουσία*), a joining or adhering to, or mingling with in any local, physical or comprehensible sense, or a uniting of body with bread or blood with wine, so as to form another resultant substance.

(4) By *Transubstantiation*, (*Μετουσία*), that is, the actual transmuting of the bread and wine into the true substance of the body of Christ, while the "accidents" remain, this being done by the consecrating power of the priest.†

(5) A *Durabilis Conjunctio*, the continuous union of the very substance of Christ, with the accidents of bread and wine, beyond the period of the sacramental rite, (from which may follow the "reservation" of the consecrated host as "venerable" in the monstrance and like practices.)

(6) A sacrifice, that is, an actual, supernatural offering and oblation of Christ, in the mass, for the sins of the living or the dead, as a repetition of his vicarious sacrifice on the cross. (The basis of Rome's profitable traffic in private and public masses.)

(7) Such a presence as justifies, the elevation, carrying or adoration of the host, as in the ceremonies of the mass and on *Corpus Christi* day.‡

(8) Such a "concomitance" as justifies the withholding of the cup from the laity.

*Ruprecht of Deutz, † 1135, was the first to teach impanation. He did it in opposing transubstantiation. The word appears to have been first used by Alger of Liege, † 1131.

†Transubstantiation would be really magic, since the distinctions of the scholastics between substance and accident are philosophically false.

‡The festival of *Corpus Christi* was instituted in 1264 by Urban IV in honor of transubstantiation. It originated in a "vision" of the nun Juliana.

B. (1) Subjective. That is, a presence within the believer, by virtue of his own personal, active, pious imagination, recollection, meditation or faith in connection with the sacramental rites; *as opposed to and a denial of*, any objective and substantial presence of Christ in the sacrament.

(2) *a.* "Virtual," as opposed to a real, true and substantial presence.

b. "Spiritual," that is merely as "potential," by Christ's "Spirit" apart from his person, or "the present in spirit" of an interested well-wisher who is actually absent, as opposed to any truly personal presence of the Incarnate-logos.

c. Divine (only), as opposed to that of Christ in his complete divine-human (theanthropic) person.

5. By whom received.

Christ being present in the sacrament, by the power of his omnipotent word and his own gracious will, he is communicated to all who partake of the bread and wine, [distribuantur vescen-tibus, ausgetheilt und genommen wird, as in the Confession.]* It is, however, the worthy communicant alone who in eating and drinking receives the grace and benefit of the sacrament. The unworthy, "eateth and drinketh judgment unto himself."†

6. Mode of reception.

(1) Orally, that is, the heavenly elements being communicated with the earthly in the sacrament, the reception is necessarily with the mouth, and by all communicants. Our present body is a ψυχικόν-σῶμα. It is the agent by which the πνεῦμα receives the preached, the written, and the sacramental word.‡

But very important is the truth, that, with the worthy communicant, "*the mouth eats bodily for the heart.*"—Luther.

(2) Spiritual, *i. e.* it is with the spirit or, preferably, the

*"Exhibeantur cum illis rebus, quae videntur, pane et vino, his, qui sacramentum accipiunt." Apology. "Quod cum pane et vino vere exhibeantur corpus et sanguis Christi vescen-tibus in Coeda Domini." Variata of 1540.

†1 Cor. 10 : 16, and 1 Cor. 11 : 27-29.

‡1 Cor. 15 : 44.

"heart"—the Christian's highest and deepest, innermost, self and being, wherein he is "likest unto God"—that the worthy communicant receives the Christ who comes to him in his blessed theanthropic person in the Holy Communion.

With Luther it must be said, that far more important than the mouth eating bodily for the heart, is the truth, that "the heart eats for the mouth, spiritually." The *πνευμα* will be more than the *ψυχικον-σωμα*, at least until that becomes a *πνευματικον-σωμα*.*

(3) Sacramentally, in a manner peculiar to the sacrament; that is, with the word added to the appointed earthly elements, so they may be vehicles of the heavenly, eating and drinking them in obedience to Christ's command, assured that the special grace implied and promised in the sacrament will be received by the worthy communicant, with due and holy rites according to Christ's example and injunction.

7. The spiritual and sacramental reception includes various scriptural ideas that are a part of, or associated with, the celebration of the Eucharist; as the Lord's Supper is:

(1) A memorial, a grateful remembrancer of Christ, especially of his loving, vicarious, and atoning life and death for us.

(2) Sign and seal. The visible, bread and wine, fit food and drink for the body, in the sacrament become the index and assurance of the presence of the invisible Christ in gracious self-giving as the food of the soul.

(3) A Eucharist. A commemorative thanksgiving for Christ's full and perfect propitiatory offering. (Köstlin.) A joyous thanksgiving for his sacramental presence and the grace it conveys.

(4) A New Covenant. As Christ's shed blood inaugurated the New Covenant, so the blood of the sacrament bespeaks and seals the pardon of the sins of those to whom the sacrament is a renewal of their personal covenant.

(5) A Communion. (Koinonia.) A common or joint participation in, and sharing of, by Christians sacramentally of the

*1 Cor. 15: 43-46.

body and blood of their Lord. A blessed fellowship of Christians with each other and with their Saviour.

(6) A Symbol. *a.* Christ's death. The breaking of the bread and the distributing of the wine shew forth the Lord's death till he come. The eucharistic celebration itself is a pleading of the merits of his atoning death.*

b. The unity of Christians—being many they yet are one bread and one body, for at the table of the Lord they all partake of one bread. 1 Cor. 10 : 17.

c. The love and fraternity of Christians.

d. A figure, promise and foretaste of the "feast of ingathering" in the Father's kingdom above.

(7) The Gospel in sacramental form. Remission of sins, life and salvation are offered him who believes the words, "given and shed for you for the remission of sins."†

(8) Food of immortality. Christ is the bread of life. To worthily partake of the sacrament is to have "an actual participation of life with the Lord." To worthily take the sacramental food is to live forever.

8. The aid of the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit is life-imparting. Without his aid the flesh profiteth nothing.‡ By his aid the communicant humbly but trustingly and confidently takes the bread and wine of the sacrament, along with them receiving Christ himself, and says in the joyous personal appropriation of a living faith, *for me, for the remission of my sins.*

*So he showed that sacrifice, self-surrender, death, is the beginning and the course and the aim and the essential principle of the higher life. To find life in our own way, to wish to save it, to seek to give it, to love it, is, he proclaims, to miss it altogether. Westcott, *Victory of the Cross*, p. 22.

†In the *Unterricht der Visitatoren*, etc., written by Melancthon, and revised by Luther, A. D. 1528, (Erl. Ed., XXIII, 36), it is simply said, in entire harmony with the doctrinal views of Luther as we have thus far constantly found them expressed. In the words of the Lord's Supper forgiveness of sins is promised; and we obtain this, not through the outward partaking of the (true, present) body of Christ, but through faith which is awakened through the words and signs. Küstlin, 2, 149.

‡John 6 : 63. "A deeper meaning than the ordinary one that his teaching is to be, not carnally, but spiritually understood." Handy Commentary, Ed. by Ellicott, cf. 2 Cor. 3 : 6 where the letter, *γραμμα*, is said to kill, while the spirit, that is the life-giving Spirit, the Holy Spirit gives life.

Below this the humblest of God's children do not fall, above it the greatest cannot climb. To both alike it is a supreme gift of gracious love. Both alike make it a service of supreme self-dedication and worship.

9. *A Mystery.* After the final word shall have been said by the philosopher and the theologian, devout Christians will still agree with the Early Church in counting the Eucharist among the mysteries of the Christian faith. A faith that is of God must be too wonderful for man to fully attain unto it. Even what we call matter has been found to be crowded with properties, which, had they been revealed before this century, would have been counted supernatural. Matter, as we know it, finds its acme of beauty and perfection in the human body. With the human body, prepared for Christ in the womb of the Virgin, God and man are united "inconfusedly, unchangeably, indivisibly and inseparably." In the Eucharist, this person, in whom God, man and nature are one, is communicated to man, as the food of immortality. The exact manner of this presence and communication we do not, and cannot know here, for here we know God, spirit, and even matter, but in part.

Here is indeed a sublime mystery, before which man must ever stand in reverent awe, yet of which he may joyously partake; since the Lord, who is himself the feast, invites him to it. The faith of the lowliest, as well as that of the highest, simply says: As the Christ once offered himself for my sin, so now in the Holy Communion, he gives himself to me, that, through his indwelling I may be nourished unto eternal life.

For learned and unlearned alike, for the purest saint and the feeblest of believers, all benefit depends upon each one exercising a personally-appropriating faith in the words of Christ, "for you," "for the remission of sins."

If it be questioned whether the results of modern natural science have not added to the difficulties of the Christian in accepting a presence of the divine-human person of Christ in the Eucharist, it may be answered that while it is probable that no discoveries of man will be likely to clear away all difficulties or remove all mysteries, yet modern science has shown matter to

be divisible to an extent hitherto undreamt of, and to have properties of a most subtle character, hitherto unknown. These marvelous properties naturally suggest that matter itself may have yet undiscovered relations and affinities with spirit.

Even the daily press affords many pertinent illustrations, such as the following. The Boston *Herald* thus quotes Prof. Trowbridge of Harvard :

"A Crookes tube, is almost a perfect vacuum, and it is usually said that a vacuum does not conduct electricity ; but my experiments have shown that when the discharge which produces the *x*-rays is forced across the tube by a very high electrical pressure, the vacuum breaks down and conducts. This is the most striking thing that I have discovered, and it has never before been suspected by any one. At the moment before the charge goes over from one end of the tube to the other there is the greatest resistance, but, at the instance of going, there is hardly any resistance at all. The conclusion of all my work is that I have made it possible to compute energy in terms of horse power. The amount of energy required to produce the *x*-rays is 1,000,000 horse power, acting in one ten-millionth of a second. This is a computation which could never before be made. Hitherto the voltage required to cause the rays has been greatly underestimated. I have proved the amount necessary to start the rays to be at least 100,000 volts. The tremendous power in the *x*-rays shows us how they can go through brick walls and penetrate flesh."

It may, at least be said, that the discovery of the *x*-rays and their power to "go through brick walls" does not make it harder to believe that Christ, bodily, entered a room with the door closed.

Assuredly, the discoveries of modern physical science have added no new burden to faith. They have, however, made it distinctly easier to believe that God himself and the mighty acts of his redemptive work for man bear that immediate relation to the entire animate and inanimate creation indicated by Paul in Rom. 8 : 19-23, and in such Psalms as the 148, which make man only the chief beneficiary, among sentient creation, of

Christ's work, and which, in worshipful praise, make the "Church the choir leader of the universe." To a generation that accepted Drummond's Natural Law in the Spiritual World with calm avidity, and that scarcely became rippled over the discovery of the Röntgen rays, there surely must be a lighter tax on faith to accept the Lutheran doctrine of the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist than to any preceding generation.

God has revealed himself largely through the objective and material, and it was only when God in Christ was made visible and tangible in material flesh and blood that the supreme problems of the origin, nature and destiny of man—his relations to the deity—could be satisfactorily answered.

Doubtless, with many, the revulsion from a view that assigns so important and so sacred a function to material elements, as being in direct association with, and vehicles whereby Christ in the Eucharist conveys himself to human hearts, is based upon their erroneous ideas of matter. They hold with heathen philosophers, the Gnostics and other heretical or misguided Christians, that matter is essentially evil; whereas at the creation, God declared it good, and when organized into the body of a Christian it is a temple of the Holy Ghost, and as a body prepared in the womb of the Virgin Mary it is the inseparable flesh-tabernacle of our God himself, in the person of Christ.*

It may be fairly questioned whether all views of the Lord's Supper, other than the Lutheran, because they fail to accord the proper place to the "creature" as the vehicle of Christ's self-revelation, and of his self-communication ("Deifer panis"), do not often lead Christians to practically regard the whole eucharistic service as "mere ideas, phantasms, baseless fabrics of a vision,"

*The ministry of Christ was to the whole man, body, soul and spirit. He thought enough of the body to heal it of every sort of infirmity that it knew in his day. The Church in our day, in her deaconess work and otherwise is getting back to the methods of her Lord. Surely Christ's idea of the human body was not that of the pagan, and the heretic, and the ascetic,—that being made of matter it was necessarily evil and the chief seat of man's sin. A sentiment like that in the lines, "Here in the body pent, Absent from him I roam," is, of course, true in a certain aspect, while in another it is based upon a mistaken exegesis.

instead of accepting it as a communication of Christ himself, in his full and proper person as the God-man.

Such a Christology makes it easier to reach some real apprehension of how God can impart himself to creatures made up, as men are, of material body and of spirit. Having deigned to make nature witness to his existence, power and divinity, he makes it also the vehicle of his special, gracious communication of himself to his own in the Eucharist.

If it be questioned whether the accepted principles of exegesis, representing the scientific culmination of the last 367 years of theological study are not likely to invalidate, or at least to seriously modify, the eucharistic doctrine of the Augustana, it may be answered that there are no such signs to-day. There are, however, most significant movements to the contrary.*

The exegesis of Luther and Melancthon rested upon sound principles that can safely undergo but little modification, principles that were free from early and medieval fancies; free also from a crass literalism that produced transubstantiation, equally free also from a rationalism that might rob the Bible of its miracles and mysteries, and did rob the Eucharist of the essential presence of the Lord who redeemed us, and who in it, by gracious will and omnipotent word, communicates himself to his own, that the indwelling God may be the soul's food of immortality.

Luther—Melancthon;—miner's son—armorer's son;—miner and fashioner of the hidden but precious metal of divine truth: Providential men, as few have been: by native endowment; by intellectual and spiritual culture; by adequate mastery of relevant preceding philosophical and religious thought; by the true understanding of all relevant passages of God's word, through the use of correct exegetical methods: the results of their la-

*Lias in his Nicene Creed, of recent date, says, that one important phase of the great theological movements in England during this century is the return to richer views of the sacramental presence. He holds that there has been developed a particular theory of Christ's presence in the Eucharist, which in its distinctive features, as set forth by him, has marked affinities with the Lutheran doctrine of the presence of Christ in the Eucharist. He errs with common English insularity, in thinking his compatriots have developed something new.

bors as embodied in their matured doctrine of the Lord's Supper, were not only the high water-mark of Christian theology in 1530, but remain unshaken to this day.

With John the Constant, the noble Confessor at Augsburg, we may well say: *Verbum Dei manet eternum.*

And so may we well believe that evermore, in the Church there will abide enough of wise conservatism to refuse to deplete the words of Christ of their rich content at the bidding of "Dame Reason," and to refuse with equal positiveness to accept a magical transmutation at the bidding of a hierarchy, haughty in wealth and power secured by gains from the victims of her untruths. To do that is to abide in the truth as confessed by our Fathers at Augsburg.

ARTICLE III.

LUTHER'S ATTITUDE AT THE MARBURG COLLOQUY.

BY JOHN J. YOUNG, D. D.

The unflinching firmness manifested by Luther at Worms won for him universal admiration. Historians vie with each other in extolling him for his noble and heroic stand. That stand was an epoch, not only in Luther's life, but also in the world's history. Luther's "no" at Worms enabled the "churches and ministers, princes and people" to say "no," at the Diet of Spires. His attitude at the Marburg Colloquy has been viewed in a somewhat different light. Whilst at Marburg Luther stood as firmly and upon the same foundation as at Worms, his stand has, nevertheless, been severely criticised, especially by Zwingli's friends and sympathizers. According to the views expressed by these critics there would surely have been a union had Luther not been so obstinate. If, however, according to these views a union would have proven a panacea for the troubles then existing, why did not Zwingli yield to Luther, instead of expecting Luther to yield to him? Was Luther more obliged to accede to Zwingli's view on the Lord's Supper than Zwingli was to Luther's? And since, according to Luther's observation,

Zwingli did not attach much importance to his own doctrines, it would have been no difficult task for him to yield and thus, not only bring about the much desired union, but also receive the credit and honor for the same. It looks, however, as if the union sought by Zwingli was not so much a union with Luther as a union of Luther with him; or a union achieved by a victory over Luther.

Thus it is generally with those who are so anxious for a union. They do not want to unite with others as much as they want others to unite with them. Hence, when they fail, they have often much to say about the intolerance and obstinacy of those who would not accede to their wishes. Among the doctrines for which Luther stood so firmly at Worms, we find that of the Lord's Supper. He is universally praised for his unflinching firmness at Worms in behalf of his doctrines, including the Lord's Supper; but when at Marburg he defends the same doctrine with equal firmness and the same word of God, he is accused of uncharitable obstinacy. Why this difference? Whilst Luther acted consistently on both occasions, those who praise his firm stand at Worms and find fault with his equally firm stand at Marburg, act very inconsistently. This inconsistency shows that they have a different spirit.

We believe that Luther's firm faith in God's word; his opposition to rebellion against the higher powers; and the spirit and tactics of the Swiss throw much light upon his attitude at Marburg.

LUTHER'S FIRM FAITH IN GOD'S WORD had, beyond doubt, much to do with his unyielding position at the Colloquy. That he laid not only great stress upon the word of God but was also bound to it, is evident from the fact that he wrote with a piece of chalk the following words upon the velvet cloth that covered the table before him: "*Hoc est corpus meum.*" This he did to have his Saviour's declaration continually before him; to have his faith strengthened thereby, and to be a "sign to his adversaries." All the arguments and flank movements of his opponents could not drive him from the same. He would always fall

back upon his Master's words and reply, Christ has said, "This is my body." From this stronghold he would hurl back "reason, common sense, carnal arguments and mathematical proofs." God, he would reply, is above mathematics; we have his Word and "we must adore and perform it." His opponents labored manfully to convince him that Christ's words, "The flesh profiteth nothing," were the same as, "My flesh" or, "The flesh of the Son of Man." Luther held that there was a great difference between these expressions. Whilst the words, "The flesh" referred to common flesh; the words, "My flesh" referred to the flesh of the Son of God. When they charged his view as unintelligible he replied, "To seek to understand it is to fall away from faith." He firmly believed that according to the descriptions of the Lord's Supper, as given by Matthew, Mark, Luke and St. Paul, the communicant received not only real bread and real wine, but also the real body and real blood of Christ. This he conscientiously believed to be the teaching of God's word on this important subject. Hence he was bound to consider the other doctrine as erroneous, and those who maintained it as errorists.

LUTHER'S OPPOSITION TO REBELLION AGAINST THE HIGHER POWERS had, no doubt, also something to do with his firm stand at Marburg. Even those who are but partially acquainted with Luther's writings know that he was continually opposed to the use of arms; that he was no revolutionist. He had no use for arms, neither did he put his trust in them. He trusted in God and his word, instead of arms and armies. On this point he was just as firm as on the Lord's Supper. To him the government was a divine institution, and the Emperor the chief ruler of Germany. He no more favored the opposition of the constituted authority with violence, than the apostle did. "It is unbelief," said he, "which does not trust God to think that he does not know how to protect us without our genius or power."

There was a general belief at that time, that a union of the Evangelicals was absolutely necessary to maintain the protest at Spire, and to carry the Reformation to success. Hence, before leaving Spire, the Elector of Saxony and Landgrave Philip of

Hesse united with Strassburg, Ulm and Nuremburg in a defensive alliance. The Landgrave afterwards formed an agreement with Zurich, and Zwingli requested Francis I, of France, to enter the alliance. In these proceedings the doctrinal differences between Luther and Zwingli were entirely overlooked. Luther opposed the whole movement. His keen eye discovered battles and war behind the proposed Christian Confederacy. Hence he had no faith in it whatever. Philip at once began to realize that the success of the proposed confederation depended after all, upon the agreement of the theologians. To bring about such an agreement a meeting was absolutely necessary. Zwingli was heartily in favor of such a meeting. In fact he had been working and waiting for such an opportunity for some time. When the council of Zurich positively refused to grant him permission to attend the Colloquy, he went without it, because he felt that "the welfare of all Christendom summoned him to Marburg." Luther had no such feelings, neither was he anxious to go. In fact he would have rejoiced if the Elector had been willing for him to stay at home. He had no faith in the entire movement. He was no politician and desired to have as little as possible to do with political issues. God's word was of greater importance to him, as a defensive power, than the armies about to be united. In fact, no one could make him believe that "the salvation of the Christian republic" depended upon the issues of that meeting. He felt it his conscientious duty to do all in his power to prevent war, and teach the people to trust in the sword of the Spirit instead of carnal weapons. In this respect Luther was far ahead of his age. Feeling assured that the object of the conference was rather to fall back upon and take hold of the sword of the flesh than the sword of the Spirit, he was compelled to look with suspicion upon the entire movement.

THE SPIRIT AND TACTICS OF THE SWISS have thus far received little attention in the descriptions and discussions of the Marburg Colloquy. It is generally taken for granted that the Swiss were free from uncharitableness, intolerance, ill-temper, obstinacy and guile. Very little is said, at least, about these characteristics as far as Luther's opponents are concerned. May it

not be that the Swiss were, after all, not quite so charitable, tolerant, sweet-tempered, yielding and guileless as they are generally supposed to have been; and that their spirit and tactics, before and during the Colloquy, may have had much to do with Luther's attitude, manner of argument and mode of defence. Take, for instance, the very popular history of the Reformation, written by D'Aubigne, read the chapter on the Marburg Colloquy and you will find some very peculiar and striking representations there. Whilst we have no reason to pronounce them misrepresentations we must, nevertheless, confess that they imply some facts not given by the historian. Of course we are not in a position to say why these implied facts have not been made known to the reader.

Take, for instance, Zwingli's eagerness for the Colloquy and Luther's indifference, if not opposition to it. There is something very striking about this. Why was Zwingli so anxious, even against the will of the Council of Zurich, to go not only to Marburg but even "to the end of the world," if need be, in order to meet and dispute with Luther? Whilst Luther had little inclination to attend the proposed Conference and much less faith in its results; Zwingli, on the contrary, felt that the welfare of Christendom summoned him to Marburg and that the results were as good as settled. Is not this somewhat strange?

Again, we are told, that the divinity of Christ, original sin, baptism, the word of God, etc., were all looked upon by Zwingli as secondary matters. In regard to these he dropped his unchurchly views and declared himself in harmony with the Œcumenical Councils. After the interview between Zwingli and Melancthon had taken place, the latter reported, "Our adversaries have given away on all these points." But when it came to the article of the Lord's Supper there was no giving away there. Whilst to the Wittenbergers the divinity of Christ, original sin, baptism, the Word of God, etc., were so important that they were unwilling to take up the Lord's Supper till these were settled; they were to the Swiss but secondary to the Lord's Supper. Why were the Swiss so exceedingly anxious to cross

swords with the Wittenbergers on this subject? Is this not rather peculiar?

Then, there is Luther's reception of Bucer. Whilst he "conversed affectionately with Ecolampadius in the castle court" his reception of Bucer was everything but affectionate. Smilingly, we are told, he made a sign with his hand and said, "As for you, you are a good-for-nothing fellow and a knave." Did Luther receive him thus because he had somewhat changed his mind and had gone over to Zwingli, or was there some other cause for using such language? Does it not look as though there must have been some graver cause than mere change of mind? May it not be that Bucer in his conciliatory efforts, for which he was especially known, acted the knave and thus brought upon himself Luther's indignation? To say the least, there is something very striking about this reception.

Again, we are told that during the Colloquy Zwingli bursted into tears. The last time he did so he was approaching Luther with outstretched arms. Why these tears? Did he love union so dearly that he wept because of it? If so, why did he not do what he advised and urged Luther to do? Or did he weep because he hoped to bring about with deep emotions and silent tears what he could not accomplish with strong arguments and well chosen words? We cannot tell. But we do know that Luther did not weep because he could not convince Zwingli; neither did the latter's tears move the former to accept his opponent's view.

The following occurrence is also very striking. We are told that when Luther rejected the offered hand of his weeping opponent he made use of the following words, "You have a different spirit from ours." These words are said to have had a very peculiar and plainly perceptible effect upon them. "They communicated to the Swiss, as it were, an electrical shock. Their hearts sank each time Luther repeated them, and he did so frequently." It is rather strange that these words should have such an effect upon the Swiss; and that, notwithstanding this peculiar and painful effect, Luther should utter them frequently. Whilst Zwingli's words, deep emotions and silent tears had no

effect upon Luther at all; the latter's words, "You have a different spirit from ours," cut the former to the very quick each time the latter felt like using them. Is not this remarkable! How can this effect be accounted for and why did Luther, being aware of the effect, nevertheless, repeat them frequently?

That there is something mysterious about these interesting statements is evident. And it is just as evident that they imply facts which for some reason are not given. Might not these implied facts unravel the mystery and explain Luther's attitude at the Colloquy in the true light? But where can we get the implied facts? Recent investigations have done much in this direction. Their results enable us to conclude, that the spirit and tactics of the Swiss have more to do with Luther's attitude at Marburg than his stubbornness, want of charity, or inability to make a respectable defence of his doctrine. These researches have brought forth facts which explain the striking statements and set forth Luther in a different light altogether.

An article on "*Reformierte Taktik im Sakramentsstreit der Reformationszeit*," by Prof. Dr. W. Walther, of Rostock, published in the *Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift*, vol. vii, brings out some very interesting and instructive facts on this important subject. The sources whence he obtained these facts, are largely found in Zwingli's works of the Schuler and Schulthess edition. From the results of the researches of this able scholar, we learn that the tactics of the Swiss theologians were somewhat different from those of the Wittenbergers. Their eagerness, long and studious preparation for a conflict with the Wittenbergers on the subject of the Lord's Supper, their peculiar procedure to secure the same, and their manner of conducting it, convinced Luther that openness and veracity were not the only weapons used by his opponents. Even the gentle, peace-loving and charitable Melancthon was thereby led to doubt Zwingli's sincerity and his religious experience.

Years before the Colloquy took place, Zwingli felt a desire to assail and wipe out that "remnant of papistical leaven," as he described Luther's doctrine of the Lord's Supper. But it was thought best not to bring "this very weighty-matter" before the

public until he had discussed the same in a quiet way with pious and learned men in order that it might have many able defenders, when the time for public action came. About five hundred copies of a feigned letter (*fingierten Brief*) were sent to confidential persons, with strict instructions to show the same only to persons thoroughly grounded in the faith, and not to allow the same to be published. The letter was addressed to one of Luther's followers and so circulated that not even the recipients were aware that they were the only ones who knew of it. Hence they looked upon the silence of Luther and his friends as an evidence of their agreement with Zwingli. The movement proved a success. In March, 1525, he published the questionable letter openly. Henceforth he assailed Luther's doctrine publicly. Luther kept silent. *Æcolampadius* now joins Zwingli. But their combined efforts failed to draw out Luther. This silence induced them to believe that success was crowning their efforts, and that before long the "remnant of papistical leaven" would be wiped out. Still, they felt that as long as Luther did not declare himself converted, or was with his counter-arguments swept from the field, the victory could not be considered as complete. Though Zwingli's friends urged him to assail Luther, still there was no opportunity for a decisive attack, since Luther refused to come out of his camp. As soon as it was discovered that violence accomplished nothing Zwingli is counseled to aim at the victory in a gentle and loving way. Luther, however, placed no confidence in this pretentious show, but looked upon it with suspicion. In February, 1526, Zwingli sent forth his first treatise on the Lord's Supper in the German language under the title: "*Eine Klare Unterichtung vom Abendmahl.*" On the title page he stated that up to this time he had not written upon the subject in German, but felt himself compelled to do so "for the sake of the laity, lest they might be deceived through some one's subtlety." Even this treatise failed to bring about the desired effect. Feeling assured that the much coveted victory could not be secured on the line thus far pursued, a man, by the name of *Leo Jud*, now comes forth to accomplish what Zwingli had failed to do. Whilst this man moved on a somewhat dif-

ferent line, the tactics were, nevertheless, the same; believing, very likely, that everything was lawful in an ecclesiastical warfare as well as in a war between nations. In April, 1526, Jud published a book in Zurich under the title: "*Des hochgelehrten Erasmi von Roterdam und Dr. Luther's Meinungen vom Nachtmal unsers Herrn Jesu Christi*:" (Views of the very learned Erasmus of Rotterdam and Dr. Luther concerning the Supper of our Lord Jesus Christ.") In this book much solicitude was expressed because these two great men did not agree "with others" on the subject of the Lord's Supper. The writer now intimates that Luther may have been misrepresented through books written by others in his name, since, according to his other books, he does not accept the presence of Christ's body and blood in the sacrament. Jud had a peculiar way of arriving at this conclusion. It is as follows: Since Luther does not consider the mass a sacrifice, therefore, "flesh and blood cannot be there;" and since he calls the Supper a sacrament, consequently, he does not consider it flesh and blood, since a sacrament is only a sign of holy things and not the thing itself. Although in other places he (Luther) speaks of partaking of the body and blood in the Supper, these statements must, according to the other clear expressions, be understood as a spiritual participation through faith! Jud claimed, that as long as Erasmus and Luther did not express themselves publicly, that long could the world not come to peace on this important subject. He, therefore, requested them for "God's sake" to keep silent no longer. The well-planned strategical movement could not induce Luther, however, to come forth and accept the offered challenge. He looked upon the whole treatise as a blind to cover its misrepresentations.

Is it any wonder that Luther had no inclination for a colloquy with persons who used such polemics; that he was not only averse to such a meeting, but doubted its results? What could be expected from a meeting with such persons? Nothing. We need go no further, since the facts referred to sufficiently explain Zwingli's great anxiety for the proposed Colloquy; why he was so eager to meet and dispute with Luther on the doctrine of the Lord's Supper, and why he looked upon the outcome as set-

tled. He, very likely, thought that as soon as the little Saxon monk stood before the august presence of the great Swiss theologian the former would tremble in his boots, throw down his sword and surrender unconditionally; and that the latter, after the completion of the proposed political combination, could return to his Alpine home as victor over him, whom even the united powers of the Pope and Emperor failed to vanquish.

There appeared now a man upon the field of battle by the name of *Bucer*. This is the person whom Luther received at Marburg with the words, "As for you, you are a good-for-nothing fellow and a knave." Bucer took no small part in the preliminary arrangements for the wiping out of that "remnant of papistical leaven." Having obtained permission from Bugenhagen to translate his Latin Commentary on the Psalms into German—with authority to make such changes as he considered necessary to produce a popular instead of a literal translation; and with the request, that Luther's German translation was to be taken as the basis, both of the translation and the changes—he went to work and so changed Bugenhagen's teaching on the Lord's Supper that it was in perfect harmony with that of Zwingli. In doing so he endeavored to leave the impression that Bugenhagen and the other Wittenbergers had, through Zwingli's doctrine, come to a knowledge of their former errors. When Luther afterwards accused Bucer of these misrepresentations he endeavored to justify himself by saying, Bugenhagen had given him the liberty to make necessary changes. Bucer found a public defender in Zwingli, who endeavored to show that love induced him to do what he did. In fact his defence implied that both Jud and Bucer had rendered the Wittenbergers a great service in making it possible for them thus quietly to acquiesce, save themselves from the disgrace of a public renunciation and leave the people under the impression that they had always been favorably inclined to ward Zwinglianism! This was, however, not the only work Bucer did of this nature. In order to secure a market for Luther's sermons, in other countries, Herwagen, a publisher of Hagenau, employed Bucer to translate

the same into Latin. In this translation he not only did what he had done before, but even assailed Luther's doctrine, justifying his action by saying: "No sensible man, not even Luther himself, would maintain that he (Luther) clearly apprehended every verse in the right sense, and had never made a mistake." In doing this he not only heaped the greatest insult upon Luther, the living author of the sermons he was translating, but also discouraged faith in Luther's writings. No wonder Bucer wrote to Zwingli, "The indignation of the Wittenbergers rests now no less upon me than upon you." But he consoled himself with the thought, that he had done all this to maintain the honor of God against the flesh, the devil and the arrogance of the Wittenbergers. Is it any wonder that Luther said to Bucer at Marburg, "As for you, you are a good-for-nothing fellow and a knave?" Surely not. If any man ever acted the knave Bucer did so in translating Bugenhagen's Psalms and Luther's sermons. In fact it is somewhat surprising that Luther would have anything to do with a man, who had treated him, his friend, and his doctrine, thus.

The mischievous work of Bucer, in the translation of some of Luther's sermons into Latin, has caused much confusion and ill-feeling, many misrepresentations and divisions in the Church. Persons, not aware of these facts, can through such misrepresentations easily be led astray. If a person, for instance, unacquainted with the tactics referred to, should come across one of Luther's sermons, in which Zwingli's view had been substituted for Luther's, he would at once come to the conclusion, that what is at present taught as the Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's Supper is, after all, not Luther's doctrine; since, according to the sermon just read, Luther did not teach the real presence of the body and blood of Christ. Yet Bucer is not the only man who has acted the part of "a good-for-nothing fellow and a knave" in this direction. In 1841, there was published a *Life of Luther* by John Fred. Wm. Tischler, and printed by Solomon S. Wiles, (of Boston, if I mistake not) which contains a selection from the most celebrated sermons of Luther, translated from the German. Among this selection is sermon 8 on John 6: 44-51, in which

Zwingli's teaching on the Lord's Supper has been substituted for Luther's. Since this sermon was not in existence when Bucer corrupted Luther's sermons, either the author himself or some one who translated Luther's celebrated sermons for him, must be guilty of the deed. For all we know, there may be some other books containing such misleading sermons. Why some of Zwingli's friends have lowered themselves to such misrepresentations and deceptions, and why they are so anxious to represent Luther as in harmony with the Swiss Reformer on the subject of the Lord's Supper, we know not; but we do know, that honest followers of Christ, be they found in the Lutheran or Reformed Churches, look with disapprobation and sad hearts upon such work and workers. No true servant of the Lord in any church wants to be led astray by such misrepresentations, and become the unconscious tool, either in the pulpit or press, of literary counterfeiters. These facts should not only put Lutherans, but also all honest and truth loving persons on their guard; and since we now have a reliable English translation of Luther's doctrines, no one need allow himself henceforth to be taken in by such false representations and become the unconscious tool of "a good-for-nothing fellow and a knave."

As to the words, "*You have a different spirit from ours*," Dr. Walther has plainly shown, in the article from which these facts are drawn, that the sentiment contained therein is of Zwinglian and not of Lutheran origin. Notwithstanding the fact that Luther has been blamed and held responsible for the harsh judgment contained therein, the same was nevertheless pronounced against the Wittenbergers four years before the Marburg Colloquy. When the questionable tactics, already referred to, failed to draw out Luther, Zwingli declared in April, 1525, that the Lutheran opponents of his doctrine were "*von einem andern Geiste geföhrt*," meaning thereby, that their holding fast to the body and blood, through Luther's influence, was a hypocrisy. This would of course imply that the advocates of Luther's doctrine were hypocrites. If Luther used the words at Marburg in "their own, true, native, original and only sense"—as used by the author himself—we need not be surprised that they "communicated

to the Swiss, as it were, an electrical shock," and that "their hearts sank each time Luther repeated them." Yea, if he used them thus, they also show us how the Saxon monk looked upon the deep emotions, silent tears and outstretched hand of the Swiss theologian.

The results of Dr. Walther's researches have, at last, unraveled the mystery of the interesting and striking statements concerning the Marburg Colloquy. The facts, necessary for a proper understanding of Luther's attitude at the Colloquy, are now in our possession. They reveal unto us, on the one hand, the unfair treatment Luther has been subjected to; and, on the other, the source of so much confusion and strife concerning Luther's teachings about the Lord's Supper. Looking at these historical facts, largely gathered from Zwingli's own works, Luther's attitude at Marburg surprises us no longer; and apologies are henceforth out of place, as far as the Wittenbergers are concerned. The question confronting us now is no longer: Why did Luther act thus? but: How could Luther act otherwise without playing the part of a hypocrite? He went as far as he conscientiously could go; and the stand his conscience compelled him to take was no less noble than the one he took before the Emperor. Under the circumstances he could no more "do otherwise" at Marburg than at Worms.

ARTICLE IV.

THE FUNDAMENTAL DOCTRINES.

BY REV. L. S. KEYSER, A. M.

To our mind there is more or less confusion of thought in our Church as to the precise meaning of the term "fundamental" in the General Synod's form of confessional subscription. That formula states that the Augsburg Confession is "a correct exhibition of the fundamental doctrines of the divine word." It would seem that so plain and simple a statement could not have been misunderstood, and that differences of opinion as to its meaning never could have arisen; and yet, sad to say, there are persons who, on the one hand, refine away its plain meaning, and others who, on the other hand, make it a reason for rejecting some of the distinctive doctrines exhibited in the Augustana.

The argument of the first class is that every doctrine set forth in the Augsburg Confession is "fundamental to something"—some doctrines being fundamental to salvation, others to the Christian system, and others to the Lutheran system of doctrine. It is difficult to believe that the fathers, when they framed this form of subscription, had all those refinements in mind; for surely if they had thought of anything so labored and articulated, they would have made a clear and full attempt to define the term "fundamental." Is it not more reasonable to believe that they thought the meaning of the term so evident that it could not be misunderstood? If the word "fundamental" can be so bandied about as to convey three or four different meanings, then indeed it is a most unfortunate word to use in a church's confessional subscription, which, above all other formulas, ought to be clear and definite.

As to the second class of writers, who contend that the word "fundamental" gives them liberty to reject some of the doctrines of the Augustana, and thus practically makes them free lances in matters of doctrine, we deem them as far astray as those who

refine upon the meaning of the word. Their first error is that they confuse "the fundamental doctrines of God's word" with "a correct exhibition." Note carefully the precise phrasing of our form of subscription: We accept "the Augsburg Confession as a correct exhibition of the fundamental doctrines of the *divine word*." It is not said that the exhibition is fundamental, but that the doctrines of the divine word are fundamental and that the confession is a correct exhibition of them. That is an important distinction. The Helvetic and Westminster confessions set forth the same doctrines, but not in the same way. Their exhibition of the doctrine of Christ's person is not precisely the same as the exhibition of that doctrine found in the Augsburg Confession. The Reformed and the Calvinist have their peculiar and distinctive view of certain doctrines, and that view makes them what they are in the theological world; the Lutheran has another view of certain doctrines, namely, the conception given in the Augustana, and that differentiates him as a Lutheran. If a theologian believes that Christ in his human nature is only at God's right hand in the remote heavens and cannot be anywhere else, and that therefore the believer must be elevated in thought to that place in order to have communion with the Lord, then that theologian is a Calvinist and not a Lutheran in respect to the doctrine of the person of Christ; but he who believes that Christ's glorified humanity is ubiquitous, and that the natures of our Lord cannot be separated, but that he, in the totality of his being, is not only at God's right hand, but also present with the believer, is a Lutheran in respect to that doctrine. Thus we see that it is the "exhibition" of the doctrine and not the doctrine itself that determines its Lutheranism or its Calvinism, as the case may be.

To illustrate still further, we have known General Synod men to point to the tenth article of the Augustana, the one relating to the Eucharist, and declare, "That is not fundamental, and therefore we need not believe it in order to be General Synod Lutherans." Note the confusion of thought. The General Synod does not say that the tenth article is a fundamental doctrine, but it does say that it is "a correct exhibition" of a funda-

mental doctrine. Surely all persons will admit that the Lord's Supper is one of the fundamental doctrines of God's word—that is, an integral part of the Biblical system. If that is true, then the tenth article of the Augustana must be regarded by the General Synod as *a correct exhibition* of that doctrine.

Even at risk of repetition let us put the argument in the form of a syllogism: The General Synod declares the Augsburg Confession to be "a correct exhibition of the fundamental doctrines of the divine word;" the Lord's Supper is a fundamental doctrine of the divine word; therefore, the General Synod declares the Augsburg Confession to be "a correct exhibition" of that doctrine.

The same process of reasoning would hold good in regard to any other Scriptural doctrine exhibited in the confession.

Another error committed by those who wish to take advantage of the term "fundamental," is that they almost invariably use it in the sense of fundamental to *salvation*. Now, we are persuaded that the fathers never meant to employ it in that sweeping sense. The fact is, it would be extremely difficult, not to say hazardous, for any man or any set of men to say what is absolutely essential to salvation. It is proper to define truth as clearly, definitely and even nicely as possible, but it is unbecoming for fallible beings to pronounce verdict *ex cathedra* as to the eternal destiny of their fellow-creatures. The Apostle Paul seems to teach that even the heathen who live according to their best light are a law unto themselves. A man's salvation may not depend upon the clearness of his intellectual conceptions or even of his spiritual apprehension of many doctrines. And yet that is no reason why we should not endeavor to gain as large and accurate views of Christian truth as possible. A man might be a Christian and finally get to heaven even if he held many errors, providing he was honest; and yet he would be a much better Christian, and would doubtless have a more abundant salvation, if he did not cling to those errors. The Lutheran feels that the Zwinglian is in error in his conception of the person of Christ and the Lord's Supper, and he feels, too, that the error is a grave one; but he does not mean thereby to close the gates

of heaven against his opponent. Because you point out a fellow-Christian's errors, you do not mean to consign him to everlasting flames. Indeed, we are not to be judges in such matters, for "we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ."

For these reasons we do not believe that our fathers of 1868, who were liberal-minded men, meant to declare that a certain set of doctrines were absolutely fundamental to salvation; for that would have been dogmatic and presumptuous. And those contestants to-day who use the word "fundamental" in that sense are surely assuming a very serious responsibility when they venture to say which particular doctrines are essential to salvation and which are not. Take, for instance, the first article of the Augsburg Confession, defining the doctrine of the Trinity. Perhaps all General Synod ministers would agree that this is a correct exhibition of a fundamental doctrine of God's word; and yet who would venture to assert that no person could be saved unless he grasped the profound doctrine there inculcated? There are many honest persons in the Roman Catholic Church who have no clear conception of the doctrine of justification by faith, and yet no modest theologian would venture to pronounce sentence of eternal condemnation upon them.

In what sense, then, did our fathers in 1868 use the word "fundamental?" Surely in the simplest and most obvious sense. What is the meaning of the word "fundamental?" It means, *pertaining to the foundation*. The fathers meant to say that the Augustana is a correct exhibition of the *chief* doctrines of God's word, those that belong to the foundation; as much as to say: "There are other doctrines of the divine word not here exhibited, but these are the principal ones, the most important ones, the *fundamental* ones."

Now, let us see whether this view will not clear up many of our difficulties. The Scriptural doctrines exhibited in the Augsburg Confession all pertain to the foundation of the Christian system, but that is not tantamount to saying that they are all of equal importance. Take the foundation stones of a building as an illustration. You might remove one of them, and yet the building might stand, although it would be sadly marred. Some

of the stones, however, might be so large and important and so strategically located that their removal would cause the building to crash to the ground. So it is with the doctrines of the Augsburg Confession. You may reject some of them and yet not destroy the Christian system, however much you would mar and disfigure it. But if others were removed, like the doctrine of Christ in Article III, the very corner-stone of the Christian system would be taken away, and the superstructure would topple to the earth.

Now, here is a distinction that every person should be able to see. So far as confessions are concerned, some of these foundation doctrines are peculiar to Christianity, such as the doctrines of the Triune God and of Christ; others are peculiar to Protestant Christianity, such as the doctrines of justification, of the Church, and of the ministry; others are peculiar to the Lutheran view of the Biblical system of truth, such as the doctrines of the ubiquity of Christ's human nature, of the sacraments as means of grace, and of the "real presence" in the Eucharist. As Lutherans we believe that the exhibition made by the Augustana is correct, and this the General Synod states in her formula of credal subscription in the most positive and explicit language.

This brings us face to face with a crucial question that needs elucidation: Can a minister be a true General Synod Lutheran and still discard some of the *doctrines* set forth in the Augsburg Confession? We think not. Why? Simply because the General Synod declares that the Augustana is "a correct exhibition of the fundamental doctrines of the divine word," and he who says it is not a correct exhibition of certain doctrines, asserts the very contrary of the General Synod's declaration. But does not the word *fundamental* afford a loophole for the escape of those who do not accept certain well-known distinctively Lutheran doctrines? It does not, because if you will carefully examine the phraseology of our confessional subscription, you will see that it does not mean to say that some doctrines are fundamental and others non-fundamental, but that *all* are fundamen-

tal and that the Augustana is a correct exhibition of them. The idea is that these are the fundamental doctrines, while other doctrines of God's word not exhibited in the confession do not belong to the foundation of the Christian system.

A little knowledge of General Synod doctrinal history will make this clear. Before 1868 the word "substantially" was found in our formula of confessional subscription. We then said that the Augustana was only a *substantially* correct exhibition of the doctrines of God's word. Why was the word "substantially" expunged? Because it made our credal subscription too indefinite; it made every man a free lance, and left us practically without a creed. Whenever a minister wanted to reject an article or a part of an article, he could not be called to account, the word "substantially" always affording him a place of refuge. It was too general and too vague a term. But if the word "fundamental" offers the same easy mode of escape and is equally ambiguous, what is the difference between the old form of subscription and the new? And yet we know full well that the new form was substituted for the very purpose of putting the General Synod on a firmer and less equivocal Lutheran basis, as Dr. Richard has shown in more than one keenly logical article. Would the fathers have made a change that they knew would defeat their own purposes?

Indeed, if the word "fundamental" binds pastors and synods to only a part of the Augsburg Confession, and gives them free license to reject certain articles *in toto*, then the old word "substantially" would be preferable; for then it could at least be said that every article was *substantially* correct; whereas the modern liberalistic interpreters of the word "fundamental" really feel justified in repudiating several articles in their entirety. More than that, if the General Synod means to say that some articles of the confession are fundamental and others non-fundamental, then we practically have no creed; for the General Synod does not define those that are fundamental, but leaves every man to accept or reject *ad libitum*, and if you call him to account, he will simply assert: "That article is not fundamental!" Who is to be the judge? But the General Synod, we are thankful to say,

is not founded on a confessional sandbank like that. She knows herself as both soundly evangelical and soundly Lutheran; and while she does not excommunicate men who reject some of the distinctively Lutheran doctrines, she cognizes their un-Lutheran character; and protests that they do not correctly represent her.

We might paraphrase her confessional position in this way: The doctrine of God is a fundamental doctrine of God's word, and Art. I. is a correct exhibition of it. The doctrine of original sin is fundamental, and Art. II. is a correct exhibition of it. The doctrine of the person of Christ is fundamental, and Art. III. correctly exhibits it. The doctrine of justification by faith is fundamental, and is correctly exhibited in Art. IV. The doctrine of the Lord's Supper is fundamental, and Art. X. is a correct exhibition of it; and so on through all the doctrinal articles.

It is painful to note that a few men are constantly taking advantage of the word "fundamental" as a sufficient pretext for rejecting some articles of the Augustana. While they do not definitely and candidly say so, they cannot disguise the fact that there are some things in the confession that are an offense to them. In the interest of clear, definite and positive thinking we must ask them to tell us without equivocation just which articles of the confession are non-fundamental; to name the ones they cannot accept and give the reasons for their repudiation. All of us are in search of light, and if there are serious errors in the Augustana, the Church ought to know it. Surely nothing can be gained by covering up important truth. Those who feel certain that the creed is so sadly astray on certain doctrines owe it to the Church to come out with a clear and convincing exposition of its supposed errors. It is wrong to stir up agitation on other issues, while this is the real gravamen of all our difficulties.

There are writers in the Church who decry creeds, and tell us that we can accept them only as far as they are in accord with God's word. Certainly! And that is precisely the reason some of us accept the Augustana—we think it "a correct exhibition" of the foundation doctrines of God's word. But there seems to be an intimation in the manner of address employed by these

writers that there are some things in the confession that fall foul of the Holy Scriptures. Then why not be thorough and definite and tell the Church just what those errors are? We do not believe that the General Synod desires to cling to a creed that contains serious errors; but if she is asked to give up her beloved and venerated confession, its errors must first be clearly cited and proved.

Here are some plain, matter-of-fact questions for those who indulge in intangible hints about errors in the confession: Do you really accept the Augustana, or do you not? If you reject parts of it, which parts do you discard? If some articles are non-fundamental, which do you regard as such? Until our theological writers get down to clear thinking and writing, it will be impossible to come to an understanding or give relief to our present strained relations. Lack of candor will be more fruitful of harm than anything else, while full and frank discussion might speedily bring about an amicable adjustment of affairs. So far as we can analyze the situation, it is as follows: There is one party in the Church which honestly accepts the Augsburg Confession, believing it to be a correct exhibition of every doctrine set forth; and they accept it, not so much because it is Lutheran as because they believe it to be throughout in harmony with God's word. This certainly is a clear, definite and unmistakable position. There is another party which is opposed to the first party and which seems to be especially sensitive on the question of an unqualified subscription to the confession. Now, what is the precise doctrinal position of this last-named party? So far as we can learn from their more or less vague hints, they do not accept all the articles of the confession, and are opposed to any one who does; but somehow they studiously refrain from telling the Church just which articles they accept and which they reject.

It is evident that this party looks askance at certain articles of the confession, and imputes certain serious errors to that document. But does the confession really teach the errors attributed to it by these critics? Perhaps more thorough investigation would prove that it does not. We know a number of min-

isters and theologians in the General Synod who once thought that the confession taught some five or six very grave errors, such as priestly absolution and a materialistic presence of Christ in the Holy Supper; but after more thorough research, they have found that they had themselves been in error; the confession did not, after all, inculcate those unevangelical doctrines. Might not honest research disabuse the minds of others? The framers of the Definite Platform accused the Augustana of teaching five or six distinct errors; but the York Resolutions were an effective answer to those charges, expressly denying that the Augustana taught the errors specified. Our fathers of 1864 made the following most solemn declaration: "And while we would, with our whole heart, reject any part of any confession which taught doctrines in conflict with this, our testimony; nevertheless, *before God and his Church*, we declare that in our judgment the Augsburg Confession, properly interpreted, is in perfect consistence with this our testimony and with the Holy Scriptures as regards the errors specified." Nothing could be clearer than that the General Synod of 1864 meant to protest that the Augustana was throughout entirely evangelical and did not contain any of the errors charged against it. For this reason they inserted the explanatory phrase, "properly interpreted," for they knew that some persons of their day had misinterpreted the confession, and hence had erroneously changed it with Romish or semi-Romish teaching.

Would it not be a happy day if all who now regard the confession with suspicion could be convinced, through more thorough investigation, that the Augustana is, after all, entirely in accord with the Holy Scriptures, and thus close the whole agitated controversy? Then all of us who compose the General Synod would stand on the same doctrinal platform, and the era of internecine strife would be past.

To give some concrete examples: There are men who seem to think that the tenth article teaches a gross or materialistic presence of Christ's body and blood in the elements of the Lord's Supper, and that the eating and drinking are little less than Capernaitish eating and drinking; but when we examine

the doctrine more thoroughly, we find that the Reformers always spoke of Christ's presence as a heavenly, supernatural presence and the eating and drinking as a spiritual participation or communion. Many have objected to the eleventh article, but more extensive research proves that the Reformers merely meant by private confession the individualizing of the Gospel, and while we may not observe the precise *forms* that they recommend, all of us believe heartily in the doctrine of the article—namely, that troubled conscious should often be consoled by the pastor in a private or individualized way, and the penitent believer should receive the private message just as gladly and confidently as if the declaration of God's pardoning grace came from the pulpit. Objection has been raised that the Augustana retained the Romish Mass; but more careful reading proves the very opposite,—that the confession rejected the *Romish* Mass and everything distinctive of it, and merely retained the term "Mass" to describe the whole ceremony of the Eucharist. Likewise a more careful investigation of the facts proves that the confession is soundly evangelical on the divine obligation of the Christian Sabbath. Surely, as we come to understand our noble confession better, all objections to it will melt away like mist before the sun, and we shall all accept it heartily, and thus establish our stalwart Scriptural Lutheranism beyond a doubt.

Conspicuous among those whose views were thus modified is Dr. Samuel Sprecher, whose very name is the synonym of Christian grace and gentleness and profound scholarship. Few men have been more sincerely and more deservedly venerated. Since he moved to California, he has frankly avowed the change that has taken place in his theological opinions. In a letter first printed in May, 1891, Dr. Sprecher wrote:

"It is true that I did once think 'the Definite Platform'—that modification of Lutheranism which has perhaps been properly called the culmination of Melancthonism—desirable and practicable, and that I now regard all such modifications of our creed as hopeless. In the meantime, an increased knowledge of the spirit, methods and literature of the Missouri Synod has convinced me that such alterations are undesirable—that the ele-

ments of a true Pietism, that a sense of the necessity of personal religion and of the importance of personal assurance of salvation, can be maintained in connection with a Lutheranism unmodified by the Puritan element."

A letter published a few weeks later is no less explicit as to the Doctor's confessional position:

"When I wrote the 'Groundwork' I said on page 454, 'We consider our creed, just as it is, the best in Christendom. There is no other confession to which we could with as little difficulty subscribe unconditionally; and while we think the forms of some of our doctrines need explanation anew, in the light of the Scriptures and the past experience of the Church—and even modification—we do believe them to be capable of such evangelical interpretation, without affecting the substance of them, or destroying the integrity of the system to which they belong.' Now I would erase the phrase, '*and even modification*,' and would only say that they needed 'explanation,' and that they 'were capable of such evangelical interpretation' *without modification*. And the evangelical spirit and successful operations of our Missouri brethren have led me to dismiss any doubts respecting the practicability of the unconditional adoption of them consistently with all the great spiritual interests which the General Synod has always had in view."

Nothing could be clearer than the Doctor's statements in the foregoing, and yet he is still more explicit in another letter published a few weeks later, when he says:

"When I say that *I give up a modified Lutheranism*, I do not mean by it that I adopt an exclusive Lutheranism. * * While, therefore, *I would repudiate a modified Lutheranism*, I would not thereby un-Lutheranize the doctrinal position of the General Synod," etc.

But that is not all. In January of 1892, after he had taken ample time to weigh what he had previously said, and had been called to account for it by some of his greatly alarmed brethren, he made this clear and positive statement in one of our church papers:

"I can now say, *as I could not formerly*, that, like Spener, I

can for myself accept the Symbols of the Church *without reserve*."

While we admire Dr. Sprecher for the many splendid achievements of his life, for nothing do we respect him more highly than for this frank avowal of the change in his views. Might not honest, thorough research and keen thinking lead others to accept the Augustana as heartily as Dr. Sprecher now does, and thus put an end to our theological strife? We shall pray and labor and hope for that glad day, which shall be a day of peace and good-will in our beloved General Synod.

Thoroughly honest subscription to the Church's creed is an ethical desideratum. To subscribe to a creed only with the lips and not with the heart, surely cannot be promotive of the subscriber's moral and spiritual life. Take two concrete cases. Here are two young candidates for licensure. The question is asked, "Do you believe the Augsburg Confession to be a correct exhibition of the fundamental doctrines of God's word?" One of them answers, "yes," with all his heart, believing the confession to be Scriptural throughout. The other answers, "Yes," with his lips, but in his mind he carries on a process of cogitation something like this: "I believe some of the articles, such as the first, second and third, but I do not believe the ninth, tenth and eleventh. But then the word *fundamental* affords me a loophole of escape!" Which of the two young candidates stands on the higher ethical plane? Which would the more gladly make a frank and open avowal of the thoughts passing in his mind? The answer is self-evident. The one who accepts the confession without mental reservation.

We would venture to ask another question that we deem relevant: By what right do men who reject our distinctively Lutheran doctrines call themselves Lutherans? Suppose a Baptist should say, "I am a Baptist, a stalwart Baptist, and I do not want any one to call my Baptist principles in question—but then I don't believe in immersion!" Would that be consistent? Would it not be retaining the name while rejecting the very principle for which the name stands? Is it not possible to be only nominally Lutheran? Our question, though a brusque one,

is asked with no less kindness than sincerity, and we think a candid answer would be in order.

It may be said that as Lutherans we accept the doctrine of justification by faith, and that that is our distinguishing doctrine. But the Reformed, the Presbyterian and even the Methodists accept it no less heartily than do we. Some time ago we heard a Reformed doctor of Divinity deliver an address on the subject, "Why I am a Reformed." The first distinctive doctrine he mentioned was the doctrine of justification by faith, for which Zwingli stood as staunchly as did Luther. That doctrine does distinguish Lutherans from Roman Catholics and Arminians, but not from Calvinists and Reformed. What doctrines distinguish Lutherans from these denominations? Our view of the Person of Christ and the sacraments. It would help vastly to clarify the theological atmosphere if some of our doctors who intimate that they cannot accept certain articles of the Augustana, or who, at least, cannot disguise the fact, would tell us clearly and explicitly just what their views of these peculiar doctrines are, and wherein their views differ from the Reformed and Calvinistic views. It would be a satisfaction to know just what they believe with respect to the real presence of Christ's body and blood in the Eucharist. They may reply that these are theological refinements and distinctions that are of no value. Then why do they write and speak of them at all, and especially why do they reveal so much antagonism to them?

With profound and sincere interest we read Prof. J. W. Richard's article on "The Confessional History of the General Synod," in *THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY* for October, 1895. We desire to express our great admiration for Dr. Richard, for his painstaking thoroughness and his evident sincerity and desire to be fair. At the time of its publication we think that we expressed our satisfaction with the article in question, and we still are very glad that it appeared; but further thought and research have forced us to modify our views somewhat as to the soundness of Dr. Richard's central position in that contribution. In the first part of the article he declares that the General Synod stands

"for the Augsburg Confession, *the entire Augsburg Confession*" (see page 473; italics his own); and then in the latter part he labors to prove that some doctrines of the confession are non-fundamental. On page 474 he quotes approvingly from Dr. W. M. Baum, who testified under oath "that the constitution of the General Synod 'holds the General Synod responsible for a full and complete acknowledgment of the Augsburg Confession.'" On the same page he cites Dr. Valentine, who wrote in 1872: "In language at once clear and decisive it (the General Synod) has placed itself *squarely and fully* on the great and universal Confession of our Church."

It is difficult to see how the General Synod can be held "responsible for a full and complete acknowledgment of the Augsburg Confession" and plant "itself squarely and fully" upon it, and yet declare that it contains some doctrines that are non-fundamental and therefore need not be accepted. If language means anything at all, then the language of Drs. Baum and Valentine means that the General Synod accepts the Augsburg Confession as to doctrinal content without reserve or equivocation. For some years it has seemed to us that some men want to stand squarely on the confession, and yet they don't want to,—a position that cannot be successfully maintained. We either stand squarely on the confession, or we do not—one or the other—and we can never meet one another in a fair, open, manly issue until all the disputants define their positions with the explicitness of the noon-day sun.

But let us return again to Dr. Richard and his writings. In the *Magazine of Christian Literature* for April, 1892, he expressed himself in the following positive and unequivocal language:

"In thus *heartily and unqualifiedly* accepting the Augsburg Confession as her doctrinal basis, and in thus throwing the strongest guards around the teaching from her theological chairs and from her pulpits, the General Synod plants herself firmly and squarely on the original, generic, catholic Lutheranism, the Lutheranism on which Luther, Melancthon, Brentz and other great reformers had agreed to stand, and on which they did

stand, though, as is well known, they held different shades of view in reference to some doctrines embraced in their common confession. Thus the Augsburg Confession, just that, no more; no less—the creed which gave distinctive life and doctrinal character to the Lutheran Church—is the doctrinal standard of the General Synod."

At the meeting of the General Synod in Hagerstown, Md., in 1895, when the resolution defining the doctrinal position of the General Synod was proposed, Dr. Richard forthwith sprang to his feet and gave that resolution his hearty endorsement in a ringing speech, offering the only remarks that were made at the time. And what was that resolution? Here it is:

"Resolved, That in order to remove all fear and misapprehension, this convention of the General Synod hereby expresses its entire satisfaction with the present form of doctrinal basis and confessional subscription, which is the word of God as the infallible rule of faith and practice, and the unaltered Augsburg Confession as throughout in perfect consistence with it—nothing more, nothing less."

This is the resolution that Prof. Richard so heartily indorsed at the convention of 1895, declaring that it was the true basis of the General Synod. This was in June. In October of the same year he published his article in THE QUARTERLY on "The Confessional History of the General Synod," in which he adduces a labored argument to prove that some articles of the confession are non-fundamental. Is not this evidence of a change of opinion, or have we failed to grasp the Doctor's proper point of view? Of course, it is no discredit to any investigator honestly to change his opinions, and we have not a word of censure for the Doctor if such a change has occurred in his thinking.

In his "Confessional History" Dr. Richard quotes from a number of Lutheran authorities to prove that some of the articles of the confession have been regarded as non-fundamental by the General Synod. But every one of those excerpts were written either in 1860 or 1864, or previous to that time, and that was before the change in the General Synod's doctrinal attitude, or at the time when the transition was being made. There has

been a good deal of General Synod history and development since 1864, and our Lutheran theologians have come to a clearer apprehension of the real teaching of the Augsburg Confession. Dr. Baum bore his stalwart testimony in 1874; Dr. Valentine wrote in 1872; Dr. Richard wrote his article in the *Magazine of Christian Literature* in 1892, and in 1893 the little book called "The Distinctive Doctrines and Usages of the General Bodies," was issued, containing Dr. Valentine's magnificent article on the General Synod, in which he puts that body unequivocally on the Augustana and breathes not a word about non-fundamental doctrines.

One of the theological writers from whom Dr. Richard quotes to prove his position, is Dr. S. S. Schmucker, for whose ability and piety we have unbounded respect. But let us see what it meant for Dr. Schmucker to regard some of the doctrines of our Augustana as non-fundamental. As he was the author of the Definite Platform, he must have felt that his view of the confession gave him liberty to reject the Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's Supper and other doctrines *in toto*. Does Dr. Richard think that our present form of confessional subscription would give a General Synod minister the same liberty?

Again, Dr. Richard speaks several times of the ambiguity of the old form of subscription containing the words "substantially correct." He says on page 485: "The General Synod by her action (1864-1868) *did* intend to clarify and strengthen her confessional basis. She *did* intend to remove the ambiguity contained in the words "substantially correct." But if the General Synod means to say that there are non-fundamental articles in the confession, and then fails or refuses to tell which they are, we cannot see that the "ambiguity" is relieved to any appreciable extent, or that her confessional basis is in any degree clarified or strengthened. What possible advantage has been gained by eliding the word "substantially?" What is the precise difference between the old form of subscription and the new?

We are aware that Dr. Harkey said in 1859 "that there are fundamental doctrines of Christianity, and everybody not spoiled by his theory or philosophy knows what they are." And then

he feels like "sternly rebuking the infidelity which lies concealed beneath this objection," etc. But that was 1859, and this is 1897. We to-day demand clearer definitions. Besides, the question is not whether there are "fundamental doctrines of Christianity" or not, or what they are, but whether the Augsburg Confession is a "correct exhibition" of them. All evangelical Christians accept the fundamental doctrines of Christianity, but that does not make all of evangelical Christians Lutherans. It is only those who accept the Augsburg Confession's exhibition of them who are Lutherans.

In 1864 Dr. Ziegler offered several irenic resolutions, which were adopted by the General Synod. The last is as follows:

"*Resolved*, That this Synod most earnestly recommends to district synods, and urges them to call to account any of its members who may be guilty of denouncing their brethren on account of differences of views on the non-essential features of the Augsburg Confession."

This was a most excellent resolution, but it seems to us that Dr. Richard in his article confesses "non-essential features" and "non-fundamental doctrines." For instance, the precise form of administering private absolution might be a "non-essential feature," according to Article VII, but surely the doctrinal content of the eleventh Article must stand, for it is founded upon express Scriptural teaching. It is said that a quotation in the confession has been erroneously attributed to Augustine. That might be a "non-essential feature," and no one would want to accept a historical error; but that does not affect the doctrinal content of a single article of the Augustana. The question is whether the expression, "non-essential features," aims at any of the *doctrines* of the Lutheran system. In 1864 the General Synod expunged the word "substantially" from her confessional subscription; if she immediately passed a resolution declaring that some of the doctrines of the confession are not fundamental, and can therefore be accepted or rejected *ad libitum*, then she simply nullified her own act. But such is not the case. She simply said that none should "be guilty of denouncing their brethren on account of different views on the non-essential fea-

tures of the Augsburg Confession;" which does not mean liberty to reject the distinctively Lutheran doctrines, surely, but rather that no one should try to force his *peculiar interpretation* upon his brethren. For example, if a man should reject the tenth article of the confession, he would be un-Lutheran even in the General Synod's estimation; but if he should heartily accept that article, no one would have a right to say that he must accept any particularistic view,—like that of the Formula of Concord, for example—of the presence of Christ in the Eucharist. Besides, Christian men should never "be guilty of denouncing their brethren" for *any* cause.

Whatever may have been the state of the case in 1864 and 1868, the time has come in the General Synod's confessional history when men who insist that there are non-fundamental doctrines exhibited in the confession, should enumerate them, and relieve the apprehensive feeling that is extant in the Church; and this is especially necessary when men cast shy insinuations at the confession as if it contained some monstrous Romish errors.

That there is cause for apprehension will be seen from several concrete cases, showing what a liberalistic use men may make of the word "fundamental." We know a General Synod minister who does not accept the doctrine of the vicarious atonement—a doctrine plainly taught in the Scripture and in Article III. of the confession. He defends his Lutheranism by asserting that the doctrine is *not fundamental*. Two General Synod ministers have expressed very strong doubt of the doctrine of eternal punishment, and one of them even presented a series of arguments in favor of the annihilation of the wicked, before a large audience some months ago; both of these men belong to the class who are constantly ringing the changes on "non-fundamental doctrines." See Art. XVII. Some men who can scarcely disguise their sympathy with Dr. Briggs and Lyman Abbott make the same claim. In view of these facts, does any true lover of our Church wonder that some of us are asking for clear-cut and specific definitions? The time may come when

the General Synod shall be forced to define her position in terms that cannot be misunderstood, in order to save herself from disintegration and an influx of rationalism and heresy. An *ex animo* subscription to such a Scriptural confession as the Augustana will at least prevent the General Synod from being leavened with the deadly and deadening errors of liberalism.

Now, we will say that when men cannot honestly accept all the doctrines of the Augsburg Confession, and will frankly express their doubts without assailing those who do accept them, we do not think that they should be pursued or denounced or abused or excommunicated, but rather reasoned with in the most kindly temper, and shown their errors. However, when men boldly assail the Confession, or indulge in sly innuendoes against it, and denounce those who heartily accept it as sixteenth century fossils, such contestants cannot expect to go unchallenged and unanswered, and must be asked to define their own doctrinal position. After all, so much has been written in recent years by our theologians in explanation of the Augsburg Confession and Lutheran doctrine, and their evangelical character has been so often proved, that no minister of thirty or thirty-five and more should be groping in darkness. All that is needed is for all our ministers to read carefully, candidly and critically the scholarly articles and treatises that have been written.

ARTICLE V.

THE PLANET MARS.

By S. F. BRECKENRIDGE, SC. D., Professor in Wittenberg Seminary.

Mars is a small planet. His volume is less than one sixth of the volume of the earth, and his surface a little more than one-fourth of the surface of the earth. His density is a little less than three-fourths and his gravity a little more than one-third of that of the earth. These facts will become more vivid by saying that a cubic foot of matter of the average density of the earth weighed at its own surface weighs 330 pounds, but a cubic foot of matter of the average density of Mars weighed at his own surface weighs only 91 pounds. Again, a man who weighs 150 pounds on the earth would weigh on Mars 57 pounds. In other words if a man weighing 450 on the earth were transferred to Mars he would be quite as active and quite as well fitted to his surroundings as a man of 150 pounds on the earth.

If five feet nine inches is the proper height for a well-proportioned man of 150 pounds, then eight feet four inches is the proper height for a well-proportioned man of 450 pounds weight. On Mars such a huge man would weigh 170 pounds and have at least three times the muscular force of the average terrestrial man.

If Mars has inhabitants and if, physically considered, they are the product of their environment, as evolutionists tell us is the case with the children of the earth, then a Martian should be

NOTE.—For the facts set forth in this paper the writer has been dependent upon works of astronomy in general, upon astronomical periodicals, and reports of astronomical observatories, and especially upon the report of Lowell Observatory Flagstaff, Arizona. At the opposition of Mars in 1894, Mr. Percival Lowell, Prof. W. H. Pickering, and Mr. H. E. Douglass, all trained observers, established an observatory in Arizona for the particular purpose of observing Mars. The report of their observations is perhaps the most interesting and valuable contribution made to the science of astronomy in many years.

about eight feet four inches in stature and weigh 450 pounds on the earth, or 170 pounds on his native soil. Combining the following factors, namely, the diminished density and the diminished gravity of Mars as compared with the earth, and the increased muscular power of the Martianist, it is readily deducible that a Martian laborer would be twelve times as effective as a terrestrial laborer in any ordinary work of excavation. In other words, if a terrestrial laborer can load twelve cubic yards of earth into a cart in one day a Martianist could load one hundred and forty-four cubic yards of his own soil in the same time. Or, if the Martianists should be pleased to undertake some great public work, such, let it be supposed, as a system of canals, then if a given number of terrestrials laborers can excavate one mile of a canal in a given time, the same number of Martian laborers could excavate twelve miles of such a canal in the same time.

Next to Venus Mars is our nearest planetary neighbor. But his distance from the earth varies between wide limits. At his greatest distance from the earth when seen through a telescope with a magnifying power of 500 he presents a disk of a diameter almost precisely equal to the apparent diameter of the full moon seen with the naked eye. But when nearest to us, and under the same power, his disk expands into magnificent proportions, having then an apparent diameter nearly eight times as great as that of the full moon.

At the moment of time when the earth is as nearly as may be on the straight line joining the center of the sun and the center of Mars the planet is said to be in opposition. Two or three months before and after opposition is the time best suited for observing this planet. But all oppositions are not equally favorable to the observer for the reason that while the orbit of the earth is nearly circular the orbit of Mars is decidedly oval. As a consequence, although oppositions occur once in two years and fifty days, the oppositions most favorable for observing occur about once every fifteen or seventeen years.

A favorable opposition took place in 1877, and that year is marked by two of the most notable astronomical discoveries of

this century. It was in the month of August, and the Naval Observatory had just been equipped with the largest refracting telescope at that time in the world. Prof. Asaph Hall turned the huge instrument on Mars. After a few observations on several nights, he announced the discovery of two tiny satellites. These he named Phobos and Deimos. Fortunate opposition! Fortunate equipment! Fortunate professor with his name forever associated with Phobos and Deimos,—Dread and Terror, chariot horses of the god of war!

The other discovery was of an altogether different character and announced from a very different quarter. Schiaparelli, an Italian astronomer, from his obscure observatory at Milan startled the astronomical world by declaring that he had discovered a system of canals upon Mars. At once all telescopes of all sorts from Melbourne to Greenwich were turned upon the planet. Universal disappointment followed. No one could see the canals but the Italian. When it is remembered that his glass was only eight and one third inches in diameter, and that the great Washington refractor of twenty six inches aperture as well as all the enormous reflectors failed to show the canals, it is not surprising that his sensational announcement was received first with incredulity and then with sneers. But the Italian kept resolutely on his way and at the succeeding opposition in 1879 he reported a still larger number of canals together with the additional curious and puzzling fact that some of the canals had doubled,—that two precisely parallel canals were seen where only one had been seen before. This was too much for the men with big and costly instruments. Some of them said that what Schiaparelli saw were phenomena of our own atmosphere, others that the canals were due to imperfections of his glass projected upon the disk of the planet, still others suggested that he unconsciously transmuted the figments of his own imagination into realities, and some went even so far as to hint at a less venial explanation. For nine years no other astronomer could see the Martian canals. But everything comes to them who know how both "to labor and to wait." In 1886 at an unfavorable opposition Schiaparelli was thoroughly vindicated. A new re-

fractor of twenty-nine inches aperture had been erected at Nice and, aided by a clear and pure atmosphere, it confirmed the observations of the astronomer of Milan. All the canals single and double were reproduced substantially as he had laid them down in his maps. Since then all of his claims have been completely substantiated at other observatories and now there are perhaps twenty persons who can see the canals of Mars.

After this thoroughgoing vindication of the famous Italian astronomer, it was quite a natural inquiry how it happened that a refractor of only eight and one third inches aperture revealed markings which could not be seen through a glass whose diameter is three times as great. The answer to this question promises much for the future of astronomy. It now appears that it is not the biggest telescope which shows the most. Much depends upon a clear, pure and quiet atmosphere, or as Mr. Percival Lowell remarks, "The important point about an observatory is not so much what is its lens as what is its location." If the serene air of Milan could be transported to Washington, there can be no doubt that the large and fine telescope in the Naval Observatory would disclose more than the much smaller instrument by means of which Schiaparelli made his memorable discoveries.

The question whether other worlds than ours are inhabited has been eagerly asked. But an answer based upon observed facts has been impossible until quite lately. The argument in favor of the affirmative briefly stated was as follows: Since our earth is a mere speck, bearing a less ratio to the universe than a grain of sand to the seashore, it seems unreasonable to suppose it to be the only inhabitable world. This argument was so satisfactory to many persons that they peopled all the planets of our solar system and even the sun himself with dense populations. They spoke and wrote about the Saturnians, the Jovians, Mercurials, Lunarians and so on in the same matter-of-fact way with which they referred to the Africans, the Asiatics, or the Australians. But during the last half century new factors have come into the problem, and notably among these the absence of

air or water, or of both air and water in some of the members of our system.

Were it not for the fact that we actually see the water swarming with extremely varied forms of life, and since we ourselves perish in it, it would be natural for us to suppose that no form of life could exist in it. A fish if it could talk and reason might say on similar grounds that life in the air is impossible. It would not, therefore, be sound reasoning to conclude that no form of life could exist in a world which has neither air nor water. But since both air and water are absolutely essential to all the forms of life, animal and vegetable, with which we are acquainted, if it should certainly appear that any planet is without either of these elements the problem of its habitability must be dismissed as altogether beyond our power of solution. The absurdity of any attempt at a solution is neatly illustrated by the chatter of the "young girl" who figures so refreshingly in *The Poet at the Breakfast Table*. Looking through a telescope at the moon which she had been told lacked air and water, it appears "her delight was unbounded, and her curiosity insatiable. If there were any living creatures there what odd creatures they must be. They couldn't have any lungs or any hearts. What a pity! Did they ever die? How could they expire if they couldn't breathe? Burn up? No air to burn in. Tumble into some of those horrid pits, perhaps, and break all to bits. She wondered how the young people liked it there, or whether there were any young people there; perhaps nobody was young and nobody was old but they were like mummies all of them—what an idea—two mummies making love to each other!" Of course all this is absurdly amusing. But it shows how impossible it is even to talk about forms of life which exist, if there be such, independent of air and water. Certainly no language in our world can furnish the words for rational discourse about any such creatures.

It appears that Mercury has no atmosphere, or so little that it cannot be noted by the most refined observations. This planet revolves but once on its axis while it makes one revolution round the sun. Consequently the same hemisphere faces the

sun perpetually. Life, as we know it, is impossible under such conditions.

Venus has a dense atmosphere. But her polar axis is perpendicular to the plane of her orbit and, like Mercury, she presents the same hemisphere year in and year out to the sun. If Venus has any water it has been driven to her dark side where it would be congealed by a very low temperature. And yet there may be a belt somewhere between the hot and cold hemispheres in which water exists in a liquid form. But however that may be Venus cannot be inhabited.

In our sacred writings it is promised that "while the earth remaineth seedtime and harvest * * summer and winter, and day and night shall not cease." But on both Mercury and Venus these changes have long since ceased if they ever existed. To us they are dead worlds like "ribs of wreck" on the coast of the ages.

As to our moon, it has long been known to be destitute of both air and water. It is a dead world. It has been studied more than any other heavenly body, but it yields no sign of life. No change upon it has ever been certainly noted. The hemisphere turned toward us is made up of enormous craters, larger than any on the earth, towering crags, deep chasms, stretches of desert, without a cloud, a shower, a breath of air, a brook, a river, or any sign of vegetation, making a scene of appalling desolation not even approximately matched anywhere on the face of the earth.

The planets beyond Mars are so remote that the question of their habitability may be dismissed as being beyond our powers of research.

But when we turn to Mars we come into contact with a group of ideas entirely familiar to us. Mars has days and nights only a few minutes longer than our own. He passes through all the seasonal changes,—summer's heat, and winter's cold, seed-time and harvest. Mars has both atmosphere and water, though less abundantly than upon the earth. Like our world Mars has snow or ice caps at each pole. They are observed to increase and decrease in exact accordance with the seasons. As sum-

mer approaches in the southern hemisphere the edge of the snow-cap has been observed retreating toward the pole and closely bordering the melting cap there appears a bluish belt several hundred miles wide and extending completely around the globe. As the snowy edge continues to retreat the bluish belt hugs up close to the melting border of the ice-cap. It would be natural to suppose that as this bluish belt advances toward the pole it would become wider. On the contrary, however, it becomes narrower, and this narrowing process continues until before mid-summer the belt has entirely vanished leaving in its place the desert-like reddish-yellow hue which is the prevailing color of the planet's surface. What is this bluish belt? It is proved to be water by the polarization of the light reflected from it as well as by the circumstances of its formation. What has become of it? The most plausible suggestion is that this ephemeral polar sea has been drained by the canals toward equatorial latitudes.

At the opposition in 1894 Mr. Percival Lowell assisted by two trained observers noted and mapped one hundred and eighty-four canals. They are situated for the most part in the southern hemisphere of the planet,—that being the hemisphere turned toward the earth at favorable oppositions. Their average length is fifteen hundred miles. The longest extends thirty-eight hundred miles,—a stretch which would reach from Portland, Maine, to Portland, Oregon, and then along the coast far into the territory of Mexico.

So far as the canals are concerned, Mr. Lowell's map of Mars looks like a railway map of the United States, except that a railway map is full of sinuosities whilst the Martian canals are perfectly straight.

The system of canals on Mars bears many marks of artificiality. It may be difficult to state in words the difference between design in nature and design in art, but there is no difficulty in apprehending the difference and feeling quite assured that one design is according to nature and the other according to art. A tree with its roots, bark, sap, shaft, limbs and leaves shows marks of a purpose, but when it has been manufactured into a set of furniture the fabricated product exhibits not only

the marks of design but also of artificiality. It is instinctively felt that no natural process not interfered with by man could possibly produce a railway, a canal or a telephone.

Now the more one studies Mr. Lowell's map of Mars the more he becomes impressed by the artificiality of the immense system of canals on his surface. A canal on the earth, could it be seen from Mars, would show a tortuous channel since from motives of economy our canals must follow, as a rule, the winding course of river valleys. Not so on Mars, for on his surface the shortest line is the most economical line,—the surface of Mars being for the most part as level as the prairies of Illinois.

The Martian canals, with a few exceptions, are situated on arcs of great circles. In order to apprehend the deep significance of this fact, let it be supposed that upon a spherical blackboard one thousand lines have been drawn at random. It would be a safe wager of many millions to unity that not one of these lines would be situated in an arc of a great circle. Of course the chance that two of them would be so situated would be still more remote. But on Mars not less than 275,000 miles of canals, forming a network of channels crossing each other at every angle and coursing every point of the compass with startling inflexibility of direction, are situated on arcs of great circles. Is this chance? On the earth are imaginary great circles, but they have no objective reality. No one has seen the equator. The great circles on which ships are supposed to sail are "writ in water." These facts seem to exclude the notion that the Martian canals are due to natural causes. On the other hand they seem to indicate the art of skillful engineers who knew that the shortest path between two points on a sphere is the arc of a great circle.

Of the one thousand lines supposed to have been drawn at random on a spherical blackboard, there would be a great many which would intersect, but the chance that any three of them would intersect at the same point is inconceivably remote. The chance that any one of them would pass through two points of intersection of other lines is still more improbable. But there are canals on Mars that pass through as many as five intersec-

tions of other canals and quite a number of instances of as many as four canals intersecting at the same point. It seems incredible that this is merely a chance arrangement.

Again, as a person raised above the earth, if the railways were visible, would observe at Pittsburg, Columbus or Indianapolis and many other cities radiating centres, so on Mars many points may be noted from which canals take their departure.

At nearly all the points of junction, expansions suggesting huge reservoirs have been observed. Mr. Lowell mapped and named sixty-four such expansions to which in accordance with a certain theory to be mentioned shortly, which he has adopted, he has given the general name of "Oases." The artificiality of these expansions seems almost glaring. They are, I believe, with a single exception uniformly circular or oval. The oval expansions are situated at the termini of the double canals or between them. The single exception just noted is at the intersection of two pairs of twin canals. This expansion is decidedly rectangular, and is limited on every side by the intersecting canals. The circular expansions are always found at the intersections of single canals, although as many as nine converge to the same reservoir. Their size varies very much, but their mean area is about fourteen thousand square miles, that is to say more than one-third the area of Ohio. That these spots are natural lakes seems incredible. On our planet, lakes are bounded by sinuous and even extremely contorted shore lines. On all the earth there is not, I suppose, a circular or oval surface fourteen thousand miles in area, standing out in marked contrast with the general surface. On Mars sixty-three circular or oval areas, marked off distinctly from the rest of the planet, have been observed, and one rectangular spot.

Again, on the earth where two rivers unite, the land in the angle between them is of a cape-like form, or, speaking roughly, the shore-line is convex toward the water at the place of union. Now, as many as eight or nine canals are observed rendezvousing at the same circular spot like the spokes of a wheel to its hub. But what for convenience may be called the shore line of the circular or oval expansion, situated between any two converging

canals, is always concave toward the water,—a phenomenon which is not only unnatural but altogether artificial. One instinctively feels that no processes of nature in our world could possibly produce such straight markings as the canals, such circles or ovals or such an exact rectangle any more than they could produce a set of furniture or a sewing machine.

Another mark of artificiality quite as pronounced as any yet pointed out in this essay remains to be mentioned. Some of the canals are double. Ten pairs may be counted on Mr. Lowell's map. They are precisely parallel. The yellowish strip of soil between any pair varies from thirty to one hundred and fifty miles in width. Some of them are of great length. Mr. Lowell describing an observation of two pairs of canals says: "The Euphrates and its neighbor the Phison I saw beautifully doubled, exactly like two railroad tracks with bright ground between each set extending down the disk for a distance of sixteen hundred miles." Natural processes produce some parallels as in chrystals. But parallels extending for hundreds of miles and visible at a distance of twenty thousand miles or more are not found on the surface of the earth. They can be produced but only by artificial means.

The canals vary in width from twenty-five to thirty-five miles. This fact seems to forbid the idea that they are altogether water courses. Several theories have been proposed, but the most probable theory, the one having fewest objections, and explaining the most facts, suggested first, I believe, by Prof. W. H. Pickering of Harvard University and adopted by Mr. Lowell, is that what the observer sees is not canals but vegetation which borders canals or channels of water too narrow to see. Though they may be used for the purposes of transportation and indeed some of them probably are highways of commerce, yet they seem to have been constructed primarily to irrigate a dry and thirsty land. This theory explains the wide expansion at the junctions of the canals. The converging channels carrying the gift of the ephemeral polar sea to more genial latitudes empty into these expansions or oases and make the "desert blossom as

the rose." A further evidence of the vegetal character of the canals is found in the fact that canals directed from the equator toward the pole are first seen in lower latitudes and as the Martian summer advances they can be detected as though growing toward higher latitudes.

Ever since the telescope was turned on Mars very extensive stretches of dark areas have been noted and mapped. They were supposed to be oceans and were described as of a bluish-green color. They really form one ocean belting with very irregular outline on the whole planet, situated for the most part south of the equator. All of the canals mapped by Mr. Lowell are connected with this dark so-called oceanic area. It is itself also interlaced by numerous canals which are traced by a still darker marking. The conclusion is that this "ocean" is not an ocean of water but an ocean of vegetation fed by irrigating canals which year after year drain the fugacious polar sea. The theory that the canals, oases and vast ocean like expanses are vegetal derives additional confirmation from the fact that the tone of their coloring varies with the progress of the seasons.

According to the view just presented there are no oceans on Mars, no rivers, no springs, rare clouds and rarer showers, and no elevations that rise into the dignity of mountains. It follows also that the mode of circulation of the water on Mars is different from that of the earth. The limits of this essay forbid a discussion of that important matter.

An attempt has been made to construct an argument based on facts of observation to prove that Mars is inhabited. The evidence is purely circumstantial, but juries condemn men to death on circumstantial evidence.

As to the case in hand, it seems to the writer that no ground remains for even an unreasonable doubt that Mars is inhabited by an intelligent and industrious people.

ARTICLE V.

MOSES AS A SCHOLAR.

BY REV. H. H. HALL, D. D.

We have, now, almost complete information of the times and peoples, in which and among whom, Moses lived. Egyptologists have succeeded in making much that hitherto was hidden and unintelligible, entirely plain. Prof. Flinders Petrie, who recently found the stone tablet, which gives an account of Israel's bondage, spent many years of careful research in the land of the Pharaohs and has contributed largely to the world's enlightenment. His magic spade unearthed what for thousands of years was lost to man's knowledge, and so dispelled the great darkness and mystery in these matters. Dr. James Henry Breasted an eloquent lecturer in Chicago University, was long a co-worker with Professor Petrie, in his vast explorations, and reads the manuscripts of five thousand years ago, at sight. Mr. George B. Raum, another talented and energetic American, is now pushing the quest of the archives of Egypt with rare zeal, and his experiences and discoveries are most romantic to hear. He says: "It is strange to realize that the civilization of ancient Egypt, had reached a higher point, in many respects, than that of ours to-day. In civil engineering, for instance, we have nothing to compare with them. When Greece was learning her letters Egypt was far advanced in science and art: In astronomy, too, great progress had been made." He goes on to state that many of our later day inventions are only recoveries of those known in ancient Egypt. Dr. Naville, Professor Erman, Georg Ebers, and others have also added much sound erudition, by their earnest and untiring labors. And yet, in spite of the fact that we have become so well acquainted with this early age, it is remarkable how little we know, to a positive certainty, of the life and doings of the illustrious Jewish prophet and law-giver. There is room for a world of conjecture. What the writer has

here set down is all reasonable, but he knows, that someone else might write an altogether different chapter, with just as much plausibility. No theme, however, in connection with Bible literature, is more interesting, and its unusual fascination induces us to make a venture.

The tribe of Levi had given themselves to the study of the higher culture, which flourished along the Nile. Belonging to this tribe, were Amram and Jochebed, whose character may be supposed by their names; the former means, "Kindred of the Lofty One," the latter, "Whose glory is Jehovah." These parents had an extraordinary off-spring, in the three children, the fruit of their marriage, Miriam, Aaron and Moses. Doubtless this was due, very largely to their remaining true to the religion of their forefathers, and uncontaminated by the idolatry which was all around them. It has happened, that a mother felt sad when she was informed that her babe was a girl, because "a woman's life is so hard," but now this mother must have felt a pang when she learned that a boy was born to her. Had she knowledge of a legend, which may have come down with her people from the land of Chaldea? It is a beautiful story inscribed upon the clay tablets of the royal library of Chaldea, that the great King, Sargon I, was born secretly on the banks of the Euphrates. That his mother made an ark of bulrushes, and lined it within with bitumen, and laid him in the river. That he was borne away by the waters and mercifully taken out and brought up as a son, and afterwards became king. It is easy to believe that Jochebed, as a woman of intellectual refinement, had heard of this tradition and acted upon the suggestion, in the case of her child. And so, out by the banks of one of the canals of the Nile, among the papyrus reeds, near Tanis—the land of Zoan—where the family lived, the future lawgiver was placed and Thermouthis,* the sister of Rameses and her attendant maids found him.

*In the Schaff-Herzog Encyclopaedia, it is stated, that it may have been Bintantha, nearly Bent Anet of "Uarda," or, Meri, daughters of Rameses II, or Thermut, the daughter of Seti I, and both sister and wife of Rameses II.

If the land of one's nativity has any influence in shaping the mind, and giving it incentive, surely that would have the noblest and most inspiring effect, in which Moses was born and spent his youth. Four thousand years ago, the region about the Nile delta was picturesque, and everywhere was a scene of busy life and civilization. The land of Goshen was so rich and fertile, that it was described as equaling the glories of the garden of Eden. The meadows were green and beautiful, and the landscape, varied by cities, which vied with Thebes, was shady and verdant on account of its vines and almond and fig trees and high palms. Upon the walls of the temple of Karnak, there is a plan of Tanis, made in the time of Seti I. The Tanis branch of the Nile ran through it, in which lived the crocodile and grew aquatic plants. Rameses II, afterward beautified it and made it his special residence, with his splendid court. Geikie says: "In its glory, as Moses saw it, with its countless statues, obelisks, sphinxes, and other monuments, and its great temples and majestic royal palace, it must have been imposing in its magnificence; especially in the eyes of the Hebrew population, in whose midst it had risen like a city of enchantment, though at a fearful cost of suffering to themselves." A sunset, at Suez, described by that eminent Oriental scholar, Professor Georg Ebers, of the University of Leipsic, doubtless was often witnessed by Moses. "The water quivered in still lovelier colors than at noon, and the finely formed Ataka hills on the west shore, stretching away to the south till they seemed to fade into the glowing horizon, were bathed in blue and violet mists, which after a time, gave place to a splendor of color that I never saw elsewhere on the Nile. The mountains looked as if they were a moulton mass of blended pomegranite and amethyst, and as such mirrored themselves in the waves which ran up to their feet—ebbing and retiring, moment by moment." Even the night, with its wondrously bright moon and unnumbered stars, was a "dream of beauty."

The opportunities which Moses enjoyed for the study of art and architecture, and the laws of those times, were certainly very unusual. Just what relation he sustained to Egyptian royalty,

we do not know. That he was near to his mother and family, and people, is evident from his knowledge of them, and his remaining a Hebrew in his life and sympathies.* He was much in the home of his parents, and at the same time, according to the Scriptures, was familiar with the luxuries and "treasures in Egypt." He may have played when a child, in the halls of those splendid palaces, and in the charming gardens and groves which surrounded them, and by right of his sonship with the daughter of Pharaoh, had all the privileges and prestige of a member of the regal household. The age was one of extraordinary activity in the erection of structures of colossal size, and already possessed many of the remarkable works of preceding kings. The pyramids had been erected long before, and still stand in their mountainous solidity and grandeur, as records of the belief of the builders in immortality and the resurrection. What a sight must they have presented, when their sides were yet perfect with polished casing and covered from bottom to top with inscriptions, and carved with sculpture. The Great Pyramid, higher than any spire of Europe, contained enough material to build a wall of stone from Boston to San Francisco, two feet thick and six feet high. It is the largest structure ever erected by man, covering more than four acres, and has been estimated as having cost \$165,000,000. These were built eight or nine centuries before Moses, and three or four hundred years before Abraham. Thebes was in the height of her splendor. She extended seven miles along both banks of the Nile, with her shady streets and gay busy life. On the east bank of the river stood the famous residence of the Pharaohs. The city had one hundred gates, and could send out two hundred chariots, and ten thousand fighting men, at each one of them. Near by were the wonderful edifices of Karnak, Luxor, and Medinet Aboo. In Karnak was the temple of Ammon, the Egyptian

*Rameses, after conquering the Khita, or Hittites, made a treaty with them, and consolidated the peace, by marrying the daughter of their king. It has been thought that this woman had something to do in directing the interest of Moses, in favor of the Hebrews, rather, than of the Egyptians.

Jupiter, covering nine acres of ground. Memphis was twenty miles south of On, with fine gardens and great temples and palaces. From her gardens, in later times, roses were sent to Rome in winter, and her vineyards yielded wines of which poets sang, and long after Christ she had "works so wonderful that they confused even a reflecting mind, and such as the most eloquent would not be able to describe." The Sphinx, the Labyrinth, and many other magnificent buildings, added to the grandeur and fame of the time. The arts had also made considerable progress. Veneering and inlaying were known. Iron had long been brought from the neighborhood of Mt. Sinai. Ebony was imported from Ethiopia, mahogany from India, firs and junipers from Syria, cedars from Lebanon, and costly and elegant materials from all parts of the world.*

Of the personal characteristics of the youthful Moses, it is said, in the Acts, that he was "exceeding fair," and in Hebrews he is called "a proper child." Josephus relates that his person was so striking that people stopped to look at him when he passed. He doubtless had rare natural gifts, and when we consider the facilities which were afforded him for education, he must have ranked fully the equal of any scholar in the world. Ancient history begins with Egypt. India and China have no records for centuries afterward. The literary remains of Babylon, Chaldea, and Assyria, bear evidence of a more recent date than the pyramids and obelisks. The inscriptions inform us that the art of writing was practiced in Egypt at a very early day. An edifice, statue, or obelisk, was seldom erected without being covered with figures and characters. Articles of apparel, workmen's tools, and other possessions buried in the tombs, have the names of the owners impressed or engraved upon them. Remains of papyrus manuscripts have been found, which date back even to the age of Joseph. In the fourth dynasty, the writings of the pyramids and sepulchers give us reliable infor-

*The art of engraving and the use of fine fabrics and precious stones and metals, in drapery and other furnishings of the Tabernacle, had attained great proficiency among the Jews, after the Exodus. They must have acquired this skill while they were in Egypt.

mation of the arts of life. The inkstand and reed-pen at that early day prove that linen and papyrus were used. Egypt early became famous all over the world for drugs and physicians. Athothis, the Son of Menes, it is said, was a physician and wrote works on anatomy. Homer speaks of the Egyptians, as "sons of Paeon, skillful above all men." Memphis was the seat of Æsculapius. Medical books were in the sacerdotal library, and all of them attributed to Hermes, or Thoth. Embalming was done in the time of Jacob. We would not imply that the masses were intelligent. There is no evidence that books made up part of the furniture of the home, and there are no characters or inscriptions representing the ordinary man or woman reading. Learning was in the custody of the priests, who guarded it as their peculiar treasure. That it had a wide scope is evident from the fact that the most eminent of the Greeks, Lycurgus, Solon, Thales, Pythagoras, Plato, and others, gathered from it much of politics, geometry, astronomy and physics. Morals and ethics were also taught. The library of Rameseum, at Thebes, founded by Rameses II, contained 20,000 books. In the entrance stood a statue of Thoth, the god of wisdom, and one of Safek, the goddess of history. There were also other libraries. One was in the temple of Ptah, at Memphis. At Chennu was a university of great renown. While the temples of religion were mainly in the large cities, the priests were scattered over the entire kingdom, and as they were the astronomers, architects, judges and physicians, and had charge of science and learning, it is probable that every temple had its library.*

*The late Amelia B. Edwards, author of *A Thousand Miles up the Nile*, claimed that the earliest known novel is *The Tale of the Two Brothers*, an Egyptian story, the original manuscript of which is in the British Museum. It is written upon nineteen sheets of papyrus, in a fine hieratic hand, and has upon its back the signature of Prince Seti Mereuptah, who evidently ordered it to be composed.

James Freeman Clarke, in his *Ten Great Religions*, also says: "We are acquainted with several collections of precepts and maxims on the conduct of life. The most venerable of them is the work of Ptahhotep, which dates from the age of the pyramids and yet appeals to the authority of the ancients. It is undoubtedly, as M. Chabas called it, "The most ancient book of the world." The manuscript at Paris which contains it

The most renowned university, however, was at On, or Heliopolis, situated at the southern limit of Goshen. "The House of Seti," at Thebes, rivaled it. Great sums had been expended to make it a famous seat of philosophy. In addition to the thousands of papyrus rolls in the library, there was in connection with it a manufactory of papyrus, at the disposal of the learned. But, having been brought up and educated at this university, the more proficient and gifted only were sent to Heliopolis, where in the "Hall of the Ancients" was the most celebrated medical faculty, and then came back to Thebes, "endowed with the highest honors of surgery." Here they were physicians to the king or teachers or were consulted in serious and difficult cases. Heliopolis had its quiet houses for the professors and shady cloisters served as lecture rooms for the students. There were great colleges of priests, and teachers of medicine and history. The temple was in the height of its glory, and its observatory, while not so large as that at Babylon, was as famous, for its horizon was wide and free from cloud and vapor. At this famous school, the center of thought and worship, the Jerusalem of Egypt according to tradition, Moses received his education. It is probable that the priests, who were the patrons of all learning, were his companions. In the library and writing rooms were numerous scribes, and in the dependencies lived a huge population, so that he had the very finest facilities for becoming acquainted also with the life of the Egyptians as he passed on his way to the lectures of the different faculties.*

It happens, though, very often that the best of one's education was written centuries before the Hebrew lawgiver was born. These books are very similar in character and tone to the Book of Proverbs in the Bible. They inculcate the study of wisdom, the duty to parents and superiors, respect for property, the advantages of charitableness and content: of liberality, humility, chastity and sobriety; of truthfulness and justice, and they show the wickedness and folly of disobedience, strife, arrogance and pride; of slothfulness, intemperance, unchastity and other vices."

*Here the halls used to be shown, in which Plato studied. He learned mathematics in Egypt. His studies here, no doubt, influenced what he wrote about the divine nature. There is a tradition that Plato even borrowed from Egypt the laws of his Republic.

tion is not obtained at colleges and universities, but through the hard and trying experiences of life, and observations of surrounding conditions. Lincoln lived among the people. He was one of them in the best sense. He came up out of the very humblest place, and knew what hardship and poverty are, and had trial himself of every phase of adverse and straightened circumstances. In the words of Dr. Cuyler, he was graduated from "the grand college of free labor, whose works were the flat-boat, the farm, and the back-woods lawyer's office." And thus he got the fund of good sense and judgment, and the practical wisdom, which made him the great prophet and master in the most perilous and needful time of the government. Doubtless, in the same manner, Moses had the most impressive lessons in what he beheld round about him. In the school of actual, real life, his thought and character were mostly shaped. Seti I. and his son Rameses the Great, the most illustrious of the Pharaohs, were now the rulers.* It is generally agreed, that the latter was the Pharaoh of the Oppression, and his reign of sixty-seven years falls probably somewhere in the fourteenth century before Christ. He was the national hero of the Egyptians and has been much celebrated in legend and poetry. The outside world knew him as the great Sesostris, and attribute to him many heroic deeds. He must have died in very old age as his mummy, found in 1886, indicates him to have been almost if not altogether a centenarian. It was the policy of Rameses on account of his fears of an uprising which might be strengthened by the residents of the Delta, to break their spirit by oppressing them. Everywhere throughout the land, he erected temples, founded towns, dug canals† set up statues and colossi and sphinxes

*According to Ebers, Seti I. was reigning when Moses was born, Rameses was a child. Brugsch fixes the date of Moses' birth in the sixth year of the reign of Rameses.

†There is a most interesting fact in connection with the Suez canal. Napoleon Bonaparte suggested the construction of a canal across the isthmus, and had a survey made to that end. Some years afterward a corps of engineers, among whom was Robert Stephenson, reported the enterprise impracticable, because the Mediterranean and Red seas had exactly the same mean level. In 1854 M. de Lesseps undertook the work

and the numerous inscriptions found on them, and in the tombs indicate the prodigious cost of human wretchedness and misery at which they were built. Fragments still remain and are the wonder of the world. It may be that each of these gigantic structures represents hundreds of lives of poor slaves, from Africa, or Asia, beaten to death by inhuman masters, or they fell down and died of heat and exhaustion. The Hebrews were less cruelly used, but such sights and the sufferings of his people produced their effect upon Moses. What must have been his thoughts as he, even in his childhood, witnessed the cruelties perpetrated by unfeeling task-masters, or heard the protests of his parents, or the groans and sighs of his countrymen! It is easy to suppose that he often stole away from the palace and companionship of the ruling class, and consoled with his brethren in bondage. May be they discussed measures for bringing their wrongs to an end, or strengthened one another in patience and waiting until the Almighty in his own time should deliver them. And so he who under God was to organize a new state and give laws to a peculiar people, learned in Egypt the grand truths of equity, equality and brotherhood. In that age and land the condition of the common people was one of great limitation. The working classes had a hard lot, and that their indignation against their employers was violent, is plainly to be seen from the fragments of statues found in the wells, and otherwise dishonored and broken. Thirty thousand died while digging, in forced labor, a canal with their hands and without picks, shovels and wheelbarrows. All these things had much to do in preparing Moses to frame a code of laws that were humane and recognized the rights of man.

The career of Moses, however, as a learner in Egypt, suddenly came to an end. His espousal of the cause of the Hebrew, as against the Egyptian, it has been thought was a signal for a general uprising in behalf of freedom. But the sign, if intended was not recognized, and immediate flight was neces-

and the canal was finally opened in 1869, running much of the way on the line of one dug by Rameses II. This seems to be still another evidence of skill in engineering among the Egyptians.

sary. And while the record of his sojourn in Midian is very meagre, no part of the history affords such inducement for agreeable surmise. At the time of his departure he must have been, judging from his disposition and extraordinary opportunities, a man of rare scholarship. He knew much of art and science and laws, and his mind was enriched by companionship with the most erudite and the most luxurious and greatest of mankind. There is no doubt at all but that he carried with him the true instincts of the scholar. It is not probable that he at once gave up all intellectual labors and became wholly absorbed in the keeping of sheep. On the other hand, even in his exile, he doubtless pursued his investigations and studies for which he had ample advantages as we shall see.

The Midianites were descendants of Abraham, through Keturah, and for that reason would receive Moses upon the most friendly terms. He therefore turned his thought very naturally to their country as a refuge from the wrath of Egypt's King. Thither he fled and joined himself to the head of the tribe, who was both civil and religious ruler. In due time he married Zipporah—"the little bird"—one of the seven daughters of the chief. Now the sudden advent of a scholar into his home must have been an event of no small satisfaction and importance to Reuel. And Moses in this seclusion and under this protection and patronage, and engaged in the quiet occupation of shepherd, could mature his knowledge, both by meditation and further research. The ruggedness and rocky wildness of the region would doubtless be a pleasing contrast to the level country from which he came, and he would be strongly influenced by the clear air and bare rock and beautiful sky. The woodland at that time was plentiful, and acacias and tamarisks and palms with rich harvests of dates, grew in great profusion. Other natural products, among which were strong scented plants graced the steep precipices and covered the valleys with a rich green. The Sinai mountains themselves rank among the wildest of regions. "Were I a painter," says Ebers, "and could I illustrate Dante's *Inferno*, I would have pitched my camp-stool here, and have filled my sketch-book, for there could never be wanting to the

limner of the dark abyss of the Pit, landscapes savage, terribly, immeasurably sad, unutterably wild, unapproachably grand and awful." How all this must have impressed Moses with the majesty of God! In the midst of these silences and solitudes of these wild and rocky regions, he listened to the voice of his great thoughts. In the beautiful words of Geikie: "What long wrestlings of soul; what ponderings over the mysteries of nature as seen around and above him; what mental struggles with the teachings of his Egyptian masters; what contrasts of the gods of the Nile valley in all their higher and lower aspects, with the traditional faith in the one living and true God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, must have passed through his soul before Jehovah stood out alone, supreme, universal, as the holy Lord God of heaven and earth!"*

The facilities at the command of Moses for yet increasing his knowledge, were very remarkable. Reuel was doubtless himself a man of education and may have been the repository of the learning of his people. His tribe was both rich and powerful. Many of them dwelt in cities, but mostly they lived a nomadic life and wandered from place to place where pasture could be found for their flocks. Moses belonged to the latter class, who in their wanderings visited all parts of the tract between Palestine and Egypt, and even extended their travels into Arabia. The Arabs were early celebrated for their knowledge and literature, and it is easy to be seen that Moses, if he had been so inclined, could have visited Babylon and other seats of learning. His writings show that he had as exact knowledge of the

*There is a charming picture of Moses, in Uarda. Pentaur had escaped from his persecutors, in the region of Sinai, and by the mountains, where was the pure air and still solitude, he knelt down to pray and praise. By the conditions of his past life, and hard trying experiences and sufferings he was now a seeker after truth. As he rose from his knees a man stood by him; "his eyes were piercing and his tall figure had the dignity of a king, in spite of his herdsman's dress." This bearded stranger assured the poet, that if he sought God, he would find him, for he himself had had a manifestation of him upon that very spot. Having imparted this instruction and comfort to the noble hero, the prophet of the wilderness turned away and disappeared behind a rock.

customs, history, and topography of Chaldea, Canaan and the Desert as he had of Egypt. So it is altogether probable, since he had these sources of information right to his hand, that he made a careful personal study of the literature of these peoples and the physical characteristics of these countries.*

And now as to these literary resources, very little need be said to show how abundant they were and how broad their scope. About two hundred years after the flood we find the descendants of Noah, in the land of Shinar. The alluvial deposits of the two great rivers, Tigris and Euphrates, made this a desirable spot to which the inhabitants would naturally be drawn, and it was here that the first great monarchy was founded. The Accadians, whom the ancestors of Abraham found in their migration from Arabia, had already a culture and civilization. They were distinguished for their astronomical observations, had a graded system of measures and weights and remains of their literature are now in European museums, embracing works on geography, astrology, mythology, grammar, mathematics and even poems and legends and an epic. The Chaldeans became the successors of the Accadians, and possessed themselves of their learning. Berosus, who lived about 250 years before Christ, was a priest of Belus, and wrote a history of that country. The materials of his book, he professed to have obtained from the archives of the temple, and are regarded in the main reliable. Alexander, on his expedition to Persia, sent to Aristotle astronomical observations, which had been taken in the temple of Belus, covering a space of time of 1903 years. There were libraries at Senkereh, Babylon, Accad, Ur, Erech, Nineveh,

*Rawlinson says: "Had Moses during these years any presentiment of his future, and did he consciously seek to prepare himself for it? Our answer must be negative." Of course, we allow that he did not, consciously prepare himself for the work to which God finally called him. But he may still have engaged in literary pursuits while in Midian, and that he did so seems to be proven by his editing the book of Job. Here it was he obtained this beautiful poem from the Arabs and with some alterations addressed it to the Israelites. This fact suggests very plainly that he spent his leisure in study and writing and would sedulously continue the quest for knowledge, as opportunity might be afforded him.

and many other cities. Among these peoples there were legends of the creation of the world, the fall of man, the flood,* and the destruction of the tower of Babel. These are grotesque and fanciful, it is true, but it is generally admitted now that older traditions, common to all the nations, were the origin of these, and from them the later ones were gradually corrupted. Moses wrote of the creation, basing his record upon the earlier and purer legends. After his opening account of the origin of all things, and of events in the beginning of human history, he takes up the life of Abraham. It was necessary in writing the annals of Israel to include the history of their progenitor. Many things as the genealogies and other records were kept by the patriarch himself, and handed down from father to son, but it is not impossible that Moses made personal journeys to all places of interest, and searched the archives and libraries so that he might be able to write with fidelity and exactness in all matters.

The man, therefore chosen of God to be the deliverer and law-giver of his own peculiar people, and at the same time lay the foundation of the most remarkable work, the most stupendous miracle of all ages—the Bible—was at every school in the world. It goes without saying of course, that he was inspired, but the method of the Almighty is always to let a man exhaust his own powers and resources first before helping him. If he could find out by his own efforts the topography of a country, or inform himself of any data by consulting the sources and depositories of facts and knowledge, he certainly would be allowed to do so. Providence is plainly seen all along the course of Moses' preparation for his wonderful career, and surely no man in the entire history of the race ever had such opportunities for scholarship. It is only by consideration of him in this light that we can get an idea of how much higher he towered up than any other man

*There is a legend of this event written in the seventh century, B. C. It was taken from another, in the priestly library of Erech, a town built in the first Chaldean empire. This last must date as far back as seventeen centuries B. C., perhaps even to Abraham's day. And that is not all, but even this was transcribed from a still older manuscript cotemporary with the flood itself, one of the oldest documents yet known.

of his age. The Pentateuch was written by one who had knowledge of all that could then be learned, and in the time when the events related were actually occurring.*

*The Dean of Canterbury, in an article in *Living Papers*, entitled, The Mosaic Authorship and Credibility of the Pentateuch, says: "It is easy to criticise and contradict details, but the combination of topographical correctness and exact knowledge of manners and customs in four distinct and dissimilar regions forms a very convincing argument. And what deserves careful attention is, that the argument is strengthened by each increase of our knowledge. The careful survey of the wilderness of the wandering, by government officials would have disproved the Mosaic account if it had been a late production, written anywhere else than on the spot. So our increased knowledge of Egypt would have detected numerous glaring inaccuracies had the history been written by one dwelling in Palestine. Finally, the discovery of these Chaldean legends seems decisive as to the fact that the author must have had Chaldean materials before him, and apparently at a time when they were not debased and degraded by the introduction of the puerile polytheism which now forms so large a portion of their contents."

ARTICLE VI.

SKETCH OF GIDEON SCHERER.

BY JAMES A. BROWN, D. D.

Gideon Scherer was born Dec. 2nd 1811, in Guilford county, N. C. He was the oldest son of Rev. Jacob Scherer. Of his early life we have no account except what we learn from surviving relatives. He commenced preparing for the ministry some time after his marriage, under Dr. Hazelius in the Theological Seminary at Lexington, S. C., and supported himself and family during his preparatory studies by tailoring, that being his trade. He was licensed by the N. C. Synod in 1840, and soon afterward removed to Wythe county, Va., serving several churches in connection with his father until the formation of the South West Virginia Synod in 1842. He was ordained at its first convention in Floyd county, Va., and at once received and accepted a call to the congregations in Botetourt county, as successor of Rev. Samuel Sayford. Here he served four congregations for about five years with very great success. From

the labors of his first year he reported to Synod twenty-four infant baptisms, eighty adult baptisms, seventy-three confirmations. At the next meeting of Synod he was appointed to visit the city of Richmond in the interests of our Church. He discharged this duty and made a very satisfactory report of the prospect for organizing a church at the capital of the State, and this may properly be regarded as the initiatory step in the organization of our present mission in that city.

In the second year of his labors in Botetourt county, he reports as follows on the state of religion in his congregations: "The work of the Lord still prospers in this part of his moral vineyard. The Church becomes more and more awake to her duties. The 153 members added to my congregations during the late revival have been faithful with but few exceptions. The people are becoming more alive to the education of their children. Sabbath schools are more appreciated than formerly," &c. It was through his faithful labors and untiring energy that this charge became so large and strong that a division of the field became necessary, and Zion and Pine Grove were formed into a separate pastorate. In this field he labored for about six years with the same success which attended his former labors.

To say that Rev. Gideon Scherer was a successful minister of the Gospel is not enough. He was eminently successful. Whilst his education was somewhat limited, he was blessed with a strong mind, which in connection with his fervent piety, his great energy and his unabating zeal, made him a power in the Church, and we hesitate not to say that few men in this synod have done more to promote personal piety among the people, to develop and build up the Church than he did.

It is well known by those who knew him that Gideon Scherer was an ardent friend of revivals of religion. And it would seem from his reports to Synod that his churches were in a constant state of revival, and this seemed to be his proper element. He loved to mingle in such scenes. I have seen him in the anxious meeting among those who were crying for mercy, endeavoring to soothe the wounded spirit and bind up the broken heart.

And as some sin-burdened soul would find peace in believing I have witnessed the joy that lighted up his countenance.

But whilst he was a decided advocate of revivals of religion yet he loved the Church and her confessions, and never believed that adherence to the Augsburg Confession and Luther's Catechism were at all at variance with vital piety and genuine revivals of religion.

Gideon Scherer was a man of ardent piety. He enjoyed communion with God. He was a beautiful illustration of a sincere earnest character. No one ever entered with more zeal into any measure that would advance the interests of Christ's kingdom, or result in the salvation of souls than he. His heart was full of the work in which he was engaged, and he could join with the angels in heaven in rejoicing over repenting sinners. His deep devotion and earnestness sometimes made him the object of persecution. Enemies would attempt to thwart his purposes in endeavoring to introduce more strict and scriptural measures in promoting the interests of the Church, and his course was considered by some as extravagant and fanatical, and he was called on to pass through some severe trials in the measures he adopted to produce a better state of things in the Church. But, strong in his conviction of right; nothing could intimidate him. He went forth in God's name and in God's strength, and the work of the Lord greatly prospered in his hands. Prof. Painter says in his "Historical Sketch:" "In reference to Rev. G. Scherer's work we may say that he added more to the Church than any before him. Some of the most substantial members now belonging to the charge were added under his ministry."

Although Bro. Scherer had not the advantages of a classical education himself, yet he was thoroughly alive to the importance of an educated ministry, and was a warm friend of education in general. The establishment of Roanoke College, and its location at Salem, is indebted to him perhaps more than to any other man. Having been intimately associated with him in the board of trustees for many years, I know whereof I speak in bearing witness to his untiring faithfulness in behalf of that institution.

But for his labors it is doubtful whether Roanoke College would be where and what it now is. In addition to the duties connected with a country charge, in which he preached twice every Sabbath, he had the general supervision of the main building, going from his home to Salem almost every day about six miles distant, engaging material and superintending the work. We scarcely think that justice has been done his memory in the historical sketches given to the world of the founders of this institution. But in this, as in all his labors, Gideon Scherer never sought notoriety. If good was accomplished he had his reward.

I have said that Gideon Scherer was a decided advocate of revivals of religion. And without pretending to pass upon the measures he adopted and the course he pursued, we merely mention it as an item of church history. Of course he was regarded by some as fanatical and un-Lutheran. But that the churches in his charge were wonderfully built up, and that we owe our present degree of prosperity in our churches and institutions of learning in a great measure to these revivals, we dare not deny. And no doubt the future historian of the Lutheran Church in this territory will do justice to the fathers and founders of our synod who labored and toiled to give us a habitation and a name.

Gideon Scherer was also a strict disciplinarian. He made no compromise with sin in any form, and never hesitated to bring wrong-doers to account, no matter who they were, when he believed the cause of Christ demanded it and the purity of the Church was endangered. He was sometimes considered harsh in his reproofs, was censured and condemned by the world, but no one who knew him well could doubt his sincerity or the purity of his motives, and when

"Assailed by scandal and the tongue of strife,
His only answer was a blameless life."

Gideon Scherer removed with his family to Columbus, Texas, in 1854. Here he resumed his labors in the ministry, retaining his connection with this synod (S.W. Va.) until his death, which occurred June 2, 1861, after a long and painful illness. When his death was announced to this body a committee was appointed

to prepare an obituary notice which will be found in the minutes of 1861.

Thus father and son have gone where the faithful pastors wait to welcome their flocks being gathered one by one.

ARTICLE VII.

THE UNCONSCIOUS SPIRIT OF HERESY.

BY REV. JULIUS F. SEEBACH, A. M.

"Not every error is heresy, though every heresy which is blameworthy cannot be heresy without some error. What, therefore, makes one a heretic I think it is perhaps impossible, certainly very difficult, to comprehend in a regular definition." So says Augustine, the champion of orthodoxy. He was puzzled by the various applications of the term, as many another has been since. Yet, it is necessary that some definition be adopted. Whether it be comprehensive or not, it must express the central truth of the word, or, at least, the meaning most generally given to it.

The word "heresy" primarily meant "choice." This marked it as a subjective expression, denoting an act of will. Beginning with this moral meaning, it soon attained a secondary sense, being applied to what was the choice of a group of thinkers that held some ideas in common. Thus we come to hear of the "heresy" of the Stoics and Epicureans, of the Pharisees and Sadducees and Nazarenes.* In this application the moral meaning was lost. Every use of the word was indifferent to praise or blame. Even Paul speaks of "the most straitest 'heresy' of our religion" (Acts 26 : 5) in a manner that has not the shadow of censure.

As soon, however, as "a clear and absolute authority in matters of faith"† began to be recognized, the conception of "heresy" changed. The choice that before had been a matter of in-

*Acts 5 : 17; 15 : 5; 24 : 5.

†Phillips Brooks, *Essays and Addresses*, "Heresy," p. 8.

difference was now a sin when exercised against the established power. The moral element was restored. Already in the New Testament we have the beginnings of this usage. In the Acts (24 : 14) Luke speaks of "the way which they call 'heresy';" Paul, in the first letter to the Corinthians (11 : 19) mentions the heresies that must be among them, and, in enumerating "the works of the flesh" to the Galatians (5 : 19-21), he couples heresy with adultery and drunkenness; Peter, in his second epistle, (2 : 1), warns against "false teachers, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies;" while once the concrete form is used when Paul advises his son Titus (3 : 10) concerning "a man that is a heretic." And in the writings directly following these the same idea was carried out. Heresy was called a sin, not because it was in error, but because it retained its position in obstinate wilfulness against the authority of God's word.

But even in the later writings mentioned there began to be a change in point of view. The struggle of the Christians with their persecutors led to more definite organization. Increased authority was given to those who were appointed as leaders of the churches. The duty of maintaining the purity of the faith was delegated to them. And gradually, with the establishment of their position, anything opposed to their opinion became worthy of the dreaded stigma of heresy.

When once the start was made, the transition was easy. From the writings of the so-called Apostolic Fathers, which gave the first indication—especially the epistles of Ignatius—to the uncompromising decrees of the Council of Trent, the whole tendency was to substitute the authority of Holy Church for that of Holy Writ. Less and less the moral element was recognized; more and more the intellectual was advanced, and made to depend upon the decisions of those who were pleased to call themselves the Church.

Tertullian's view was as confusing as his logic. Origen made the fact of the heresy depend on the size of the error held,—which makes one wonder by what manner of means the guilt could be measured. Jerome and Augustine both recognized the moral element; but Jerome's position was marred by his

usual vacillation and dread of heterodoxy, while Augustine continually confounded the authority of the Church with that of the Scriptures.

But the tendency was a welcome one in that age, and grew apace. At the very time that Augustine wrote there was living one who afterwards gave the watchword of rigid orthodoxy—Vincent of Lerius. In his *Commonitorium* (sec. 6) he wrote what may be accepted as the first frank recognition of the transition already unconsciously effected. "In the Catholic Church itself all possible care must be taken that we hold that faith which has been believed everywhere, always, by all"—"*quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus*," that impossible touchstone of true doctrine! How sad to think that he who supplied the rallying cry of orthodoxy should after all rest under the horrible suspicion of the semi-Pelagian heresy! Who is sufficient!

Passing rapidly over the intervening centuries, let us consider two statements that may be accepted as final. Abbé Bergier, in his dictionary of theology, defines "heresy" as "a voluntary and obstinate error, contrary to some dogma of faith." So far, good; but he goes on to say that the heresy is displayed by opposition to the authority of the Church which has been made the depository of faith and doctrine. Join to this the dictum of Trent: "A person is not to be called a heretic as soon as he errs in matters of faith; then only is he to be so called when, in defiance of the authority of the Church, he maintains impious opinions with unyielding pertinacity." Nowhere is the supereminent position of the Church set forth in more unmistakable terms. The transition is completed and fixed in the form of a dogma which justifies itself under the shadow of the all-protecting ægis of "*quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus*."

In the Reformation, the moral idea again connected itself with the conception of heresy. Conflict with the hierarchy naturally led to the laying of emphasis on the supremacy of the Scriptures. No man could be called a heretic, save one who defied God by disobedience to the word he had given for guidance. But the spirit of the times was too strong. The stress of controversy and earlier training led to a gradual change in the con-

ception. The *moral* factor retreated into the back-ground ever more and more, and the *formal* took its place. On the throne of the deposed Holy Church, systematized dogma was set to rule with a rod of iron. It was but a change of masters with nothing to choose between them for arbitrariness. A Luther might contend that heresy was "a spiritual thing," a Melancthon deprecate the use of violence, but a Calvin represented more nearly the spirit of intolerance in his times, and so the usurper was legitimated on the territory of Protestantism.

Time has softened the rigor of that conflict. Toleration for divergence of thought has been granted in ever-increasing measure. Much that is now accepted, then received unlimited condemnation. The moral side of heresy has again asserted itself. But even yet there is confusion in the use of the term. In the literature on the subject the varying content of the word is a constant source of bewilderment. What then are we to take as a fair definition of "heresy"?

It will not be possible to take the scriptural use of the word as standard. Such a choice would be to abandon the discussion at once, and lose sight of the vast number of heresies that could not be classed under that conception. Hardly a heresy can be mentioned that began in pride of spirit, and was continued in conscious opposition to the truth. It will be necessary, rather, to take the term in the sense established by the use of centuries. Whether it be accurate or not, it is the only definition by which we may understand the heresies that fill the pages of ecclesiastical history. And, if an uncomfortable sense of its original meaning abide, it must be remembered that the blame arising from such a conception is not to be applied to heresies developed through mental activity alone. Heresy, then, is the holding of any doctrine or belief at variance with the recognized standard, or doctrinal system, of a religious body. This will apply to any heresy, whether voluntary or involuntary, which has manifested itself in the history of the Christian religion.

"In reading ecclesiastical history when I was an Anglican," says Newman in his *Apologia*, "it used to be forcibly brought home to me how the initial error of what afterwards became

heresy was the urging forward some truth, against the prohibition of authority, at an unseasonable time."* Not many outside the Roman Catholic Church would agree with the *use* Newman makes of this statement, but few indeed would find fault with the statement itself. Many names recur to which this would be applicable, but, among them all, none stands out with greater distinctness than that of Nestorius.

He had been called from Antioch to Constantinople to be bishop of that city. The place of his former service, his eloquence and his ascetic life, reminded the people of Chrysostom who had come to them thirty years before, and they congratulated themselves on obtaining another "golden mouth." His entrance into office was marked by great zeal for orthodoxy; and his first act was to obtain an imperial edict against the various heretical bodies then enjoying certain liberties in his diocese. All seemed propitious for Nestorius, and he could well be at ease in the midst of defeated rivals.

But his sky soon darkened. One of his presbyters, Anastasius—of the same school of thought as Nestorius—took exception to the use of the word "Theotokos" as applied to Mary. With more zeal than prudence he denounced it in unmeasured terms, urging that the unthinking use of it by the people was inimical to true doctrine. Complaint against the presbyter was immediately carried before Nestorius, who openly defended him in public service and pointed out the dishonor done to God by the common use of the term. At once there was division among the people and his rivals ranged themselves in the opposition.

To Nestorius the term expressed but a theological idea, and, as such, was accepted by him with certain modifications. To the people, however, it represented at the same time a mighty religious sentiment. Being closely connected with the growing veneration for Mary, it fell within the bounds of devotion that lies so close to the hearts of the people, and thus it touched the most violent passions. It was on these the enemies of Nestor-

**Apologia pro sua Vita*, J. H. Newman, p. 259.

ius played, and soon the city was in an uproar, while every day but added intensity and territory to the tumult.

Nestorius had an enemy in Cyril of Alexandria. He was a worthy successor of the unscrupulous Theophilus and, like him, his chief ambition was to make Constantinople feel the power of Alexandria. That Nestorius was an Antiochian caused him to be hated with especial fervor, because of his predecessor, Chrysostom. It had not been so long before this that Cyril had been forced to retract Alexandria's condemnation of Chrysostom and the act had not been very pleasant. But now, in the difficulty that had overtaken Nestorius, Cyril saw the opportunity to heal his wounded pride, and entered into the controversy to humble his adversary. Not many weeks elapsed until it was seen that the only way to settle the vexed question was to assemble the bishops in an ecumenical council. The charges of heresy had become too pointed and violent on both sides to be disregarded.

It is not necessary to enter into the details of the plans by which Cyril effected his purpose. It is sufficient to know that when the Council met in Ephesus, he had enough partisans there to control the actions of the assembly. When Nestorius refused to appear before the Council at the summons of Cyril, because all the bishops invited had not yet appeared, his enemy caused him to be condemned unheard in the first day's session. The tools worked well in Cyril's hand. They duly praised his orthodoxy and were properly horrified at the impious wickedness of Nestorius. But the supreme moment came when, under skilful management, with a unanimity that showed previous instruction, all the bishops *shouted* together:* "Let him be anathema who does not anathematize Nestorius! The right faith anathematizes him! The Holy Synod anathematizes him! Let him be anathema who communicates with Nestorius! And we all anathematize the epistle and the dogmas of Nestorius! We all anathematize the heretic Nestorius! We

*Authoritative Christianity, Counc. of Eph., Act I., Jas. Chrystal, pp. 176-178.

all anathematize those who communicate with Nestorius! We anathematize the impious faith of Nestorius! We all anathematize the impious doctrine of Nestorius! We all anathematize the impious Nestorius! All the inhabited world anathematizes his impious religion! Let him be anathema who does not anathematize him! The right faith anathematizes him! The Holy Synod anathematizes him! Let him be anathema who communicates with Nestorius!"

The condemnation has been quoted in full to show the spirit of the assembly. The very iteration showed a vindictiveness far removed from the heart-sorrow over an erring brother avowed in this Synod, professedly guided by the Holy Spirit.

There was difficulty in having the sentence ratified at first, but Cyril was finally victorious. All the powerful friends of Nestorius, in court and church, deserted him, and he was driven into exile, branded for all the ages as a contumacious heretic. Yet, of what had he been guilty? His life had been pure, yet they overwhelmed him with calumnies. His zeal against heretics had been unquestioned,—but he did that to cover up his own heresy, his enemies said. "He asserted, indeed, and rightly, the duality of the natures, and the continued distinction between them; he denied, with equal correctness, that God, as such, could either be born, or suffer and die."* If his statements were heretical, it was because he was judged from the standpoint of an alien and rival school. If he "pressed the distinction of the two natures to double personality,"† his enemies drove him to that by the violence of their invective.

There could be no sympathy between the two schools. Only time could point out that the method of Alexandria was essentially wrong and the grammatico-historical method of Antioch the only true one. After many centuries the contention of Nestorius was justified. His substitution of "Christotokos" for "Theotokos" was acknowledged to be correct, and, to-day, Nestorius, the heresiarch, the schismatic, is vindicated in the minds of all unprejudiced students of history.

*Hist. of Christian Church, Schaff, Vol. III., p. 718.

†Ibid., I., p. 718.

But, when we turn our attention to the adversary of Nestorius, the wonder deepens. Cyril—court-politician, instigator of seditions, murderer of Hypatia!—to point the finger of accusation at Nestorius! He professed great sorrow over the danger threatening the true doctrine; yet every day he crucified it in his life. Bribery, under cover of the oriental custom of offering gifts, could gain him the victory, but the church of Alexandria had to mourn on account of the depths of poverty to which he brought it. It takes all the genius of a Hefele to defend this canonized saint from his own deeds, but, in the end, these very deeds hale him before the tribunal. And, in addition, when we study the Monophysite and Monothelite heresies, it is upon Cyril and his school that we must place the responsibility.

What has been said of Nestorius could, in great measure, be attributed to many others. Indeed, it gave Vincent of Lerins great concern that nearly all the heretics were men of pure, unselfish lives and great endowments; but he comforted himself by arguing that they must needs be dominated by an all-absorbing ambition from the moment they dared oppose Holy Church. But, passing rapidly by many who urge themselves upon our attention, let us come to one who is very familiar to us.

If there is any virtue in our definition, then Luther is the chief among heretics. His life, when once he was aroused, was one long opposition to accepted standards. It is not necessary to give the details of his struggle with the papacy. Let it suffice to note a few of the inconsistencies which his keen eye detected.

To one with the earnest and practical mind of Luther, nothing would be more apparent than the contrast between the teaching and the practice of the hierarchy. What was required of the people was totally disregarded by the clergy. Moreover, it was becoming evident that much of the disorder of Christendom had risen from the dogmas themselves, which the Church and the priests had forced upon the people. To see was to feel, and then to speak, and right vigorously Luther voiced his condemnation of the abuses. He had been taught that the Bible

was the inspired word of God, and that it was the Church's office to interpret it correctly. What he *saw* was the greatest possible contradiction between the standard and the practice. Where peace and humility were enjoined, pride and contention were displayed. Where purity and love should abound, giant lusts wielded the weapons of malignity and hate. And, when his protest was expressed, what a storm arose!

One is curious to know by what weighty arguments the priestly power set this sturdy objector right. Perhaps, the best expression of that will be found in the letter of Erasmus to the Archbishop of Mentz when excusing himself from attacking Luther.* "Certain divines that I know will neither set him right nor point out where he is wrong. They only howl and raise the mob upon him. They shout out 'heresy, heretic, heresiarch, schismatic, Antichrist,' and not a word besides; and their language is the more odious because most of them have never looked into his writings." It was the old summary custom. But, then, it was so comfortable and effective! No need of laborious study to refute him; to brand him as a heretic would be sufficient. It was so easy to be a heretic in those days!

There was another inconsistency that Luther noticed. It was between the clear, sublime thoughts of Holy Writ and the hair-splitting puerilities of the Schoolmen. It was their *duty* to set forth these truths in easier form for those less favored. Let Erasmus tell us what their *practice* was. His words are a comment on 1 Tim. 1:6, concerning vain disputations, as it appears in his edition of the Greek Testament.† "Is the proposition that God is a beetle or a pumpkin as probable antecedently as the proposition that God is man? * * The Schoolmen have been arguing for generations whether the proposition that Christ exists from eternity is correctly stated; whether he is compounded of two natures or consists of two natures; whether he is *conflatus*, or *commixtus*, or *conglutinator*, or *coaumentatus*, or *geminatus*, or *copulatus*. The present opinion is that not any of these participles is right, and we are to have a new word,

*Life and Letters of Erasmus, Froude, p. 124, 125.

†Life and Letters of Erasmus, Froude, p. 244.

unitus, which still is to explain nothing. * * * And all this stuff, of which we know nothing and are not required to know anything, they treat as the citadel of our faith."

It did no good to argue against such folly. The only reply of the doctors was to charge their opponent with heresy, and seek to overwhelm him with fresh thunderbolts from their arsenals. Definition was piled on definition; "conclusions, corollaries, propositions explicit and propositions implicit"* were hurled in battle array against him. As Erasmus said of them:† "The head of Jupiter was not so full of conundrums when he called for Vulcan with his axe to deliver him."

And, if an insolent rebel survived this, the powerful arm of the Church could effect silence.

There were many besides Luther who opposed the abuses of their times, and criticised the dogmas imposed upon them. The whole career of Erasmus was a continued protest against crying evils. "Heretic" was a common name for him among the clergy, and, so he told his friend, Lewis Ber,—he understood "how Arius and Tertullian and Wickliff were driven into schism by malicious clergy and wicked monks."‡ Colet of Oxford admitted privately that many things were generally taught which he did not believe, but he would not create scandal by blurting out his objections. No book could be so heretical but he would read it, and read it carefully.§ And, Erasmus declares, "he learnt more from such books than he learnt from dogmatism and interested orthodoxy."|| Yet both these men died in the bosom of Holy Church, in "the odor of sanctity;" while Luther became the arch-heretic. His earnest appeals in behalf of orthodoxy brought him no other reward, and, day by day, he drifted farther and farther from the moorings appointed in the Church's harbor. His very nature compelled him to continue in his protests so long as the evils remained. The clergy might howl, the pope might thunder; but a clergy so debased, and a pope, of whom his staunchest admirer said,¶ "He would

*Encomium Moriae, Erasmus, p. 122.

†Ibid, p. 133.

‡Life and Letters of Erasmus, Froude, p. 356.

§Ibid, p. 100.

||Ibid, p. 100.

¶Council of Trent, Froude, p. 27.

have been a perfect pope had he known, or cared anything for, religion," could not command the submission of one whose authority was seated in the Highest.

There is no need to continue. Many others besides Nestorius and Luther could be used as illustrations to enforce the argument, but they would hardly make it more conclusive. Indeed, one is almost forced at times, in the study of the heresies, to believe that the heretics alone were "unconscious" of anything but the desire to be true to what they believed; so often the orthodox party is marked by the spirit of prejudgment that determines to uphold the standard accepted at the time, no matter what may be proved against it. It may be said in extenuation of this course that it is due to the natural conservatism of human nature, which takes alarm at anything that touches the supernatural realm. True, but the uneasy sense of fear that accompanies it, together with the many injustices practised in thought, word and deed, show that orthodoxy, so-called, is often unsure of its own ground.

In the conflicts that occur, orthodoxy is generally successful for the time being. Only Time brings the relentless Nemesis that turns the brilliant victory into a shameful defeat. The staunch defender of "the right faith" is held up in his true character—what Milton calls "a heretic in the truth," since "he believes things only because * * the assembly so determines." The heretic is vindicated even in his error, because his spirit has been the spirit of Truth. He has seen in the teaching of the Church that which is inconsistent or doubtful or misleading, and he has honestly endeavored to set it right. Opposition has come, but he has the eternal persistence of Truth in his heart and cannot be daunted. The goal of perfection is before him and no obstacle can turn him from the way that leads to it.

So it will ever be. While a single doctrine remains in perplexing form will men arise to clear away the difficulties. Scorn, contumely, persecution, the ban of the Church, may be their lot; that will make no difference. As a wise theologian ventured to say at the Council of Trent: "Heresy can never be silenced by hurling anathemas at it. The way to get rid of

heresy is to tolerate differences of opinion. Thus, and in no other way, can men come to understand each other."* It will do no good to oppose the innovation in the spirit of hate. If it is true, it must conquer in any event; but the victory of truth should be in love. Nor will it serve the purpose to cling to the old confusion, in vain hope that the truth will sometime rise triumphantly out of it, and to oppose the unconscious spirit of heresy that seeks for higher truth, because it leads to error. The very tendency to extremes shows the vitality of the heresy. Whatever may be done in opposition, it must and will prevail. And, though its vision clothe the truth with error, yet, as Bacon says: "Truth emerges from error sooner than from confusion."

ARTICLE VIII.

ORIENTAL ARCHÆOLOGY AND THE OLD TESTAMENT.

BY REV. JUNIUS B. FOX, PH. D.

During the last half century a new world has been opened before us by the explorers, excavators, and decipherers of the ancient monuments of the East. The recent researches of eminent archaeologists, philologists and historians, not only as private enterprises, but under governmental direction and university expeditions, have resurrected from their long-forgotten graves the great civilizations of the past and we are brought face to face with their wonderfully surprising and revolutionizing revelations. Leading specialists of Germany, England, France and America, during the last decenniums, have been ardently engaged in studying, arranging and illustrating the results of the new science, particularly in their relation to the Old Testament Literature. Representative American scholars, as McCurdy, Bliss, Ward, Hilprecht, and others, have not only eagerly watched the results of the discoveries in Egypt and Babylonia, Palestine, Arabia, Assyria and Asia Minor, but themselves rank among the foremost specialists on both continents. The en-

*Council of Trent, Froude, p. 223.

thusiasm displayed by these eminent scholars, stimulated doubtless by the arrogant assumptions of the "Higher Criticism," is continually spreading to an ever-widening circle of less prominent theologians and educated laymen. Dr. Fritz Hommel, the distinguished Professor of Semitic Languages at the University of Munich, recently wrote: "I look forward to the time when every enlightened reader of the Bible will be something of an archaeologist: in England and America this is much more generally the case than in Germany, a fact which is proved by the large circulation attained by popular scientific works on Assyriology and the literature of the Old Testament." (The Ancient Hebrew Tradition, Pref. p. VIII.) Perhaps not a few of our clergy and thoughtful laymen have read the magnificent works of Sayce, Maspero, Hommel, Bissell, and the first volume edited by Hilprecht publishing the results of the Babylonian expedition of the University of Pennsylvania, and others of the numberless books, periodicals and magazines in the department of Biblical Archaeology. A larger circle of readers have read the recent series of articles in *The Sunday-School Times*, and the archaeological department of the *Homiletic Review*. An interest, so widely prevalent and diffused, ought to guarantee a thorough discussion of this subject and a patient investigation by those who have not yet undertaken it.

Assyriology is the latest offspring of Archaeology and Philology. The land of its nativity is Western Asia, amid the ruins of Assyria, Babylonia, Nineveh and Khorsabad, while it has been nourished and brought to its present development in the quiet studies of European and American scholars. The almost unexampled swiftness which has characterized its growth has awakened suspicions of an ominous precocity, and they have not been altogether without foundation. Enthusiasts and devotees, impelled more by personal ambition than love of the truth, have become enamored of the fascinating charms of this youngest daughter of science, and unconsciously fallen into extravagances of admiration and errors of understanding wholly unwarranted by the facts. Either as excavators in the marshes of Mesopotamia, or as decipherers of the cuneiform documents

there unearthed by the spade of the explorer, or elaborating fictitious theories and hypothetic conjectures from imperfect and second-hand information, certain young thinkers especially, "hungry for fresh distinction," have become disciples of the archaeological masters to gain a cheap notoriety for themselves, regardless of the consequences for God's kingdom and his righteousness.

The irrefutable achievements and deductions of the great specialists in this department are, however, surprising in extent and apparently incontrovertible in fact. Men of indisputable character and scholarship, with the commission of great centers of learning as their authority, and "counting not their own lives dear unto themselves," have braved the perils of the sea, robbers, and savages relying only upon God for protection, to uncover the light imprisoned in the storm-beaten walls of forgotten temples and buried palaces of a primitive, long-forgotten world.

The Babylonian Expedition of the University of Pennsylvania, costing, to date, about seventy thousand dollars for the excavation in the vicinity of Nuffar, has recovered over thirty-two thousand cuneiform tablets, many of which have an antiquity of 2800 years B. C. "Of the manifold character of these documents—syllabaries, letters, chronological lists, historical fragments, astronomical and religious texts, inscriptions referring to buildings, votive tablets, dedications, inventories, contracts, etc.—nothing less than an exhaustive examination can give a clear idea." (Research in Bible Lands, p. 60.) The classification and editing of these important results have been entrusted to Doctor Hilprecht, the Assyriologist of the expedition, who has planned their publication in four series of from ten to fifteen volumes each. In this encyclopedia of Oriental Archaeology there will be illustrations and descriptions of the multifarious results of this pre-eminently important expedition. Hundreds of inscribed bricks, door sockets, marble vases, and clay stamps for bricks, and especially the inscribed sacrificial vessels and votive objects belonging to the kings of the oldest

dynasties of Ur and Erech, hitherto unknown; clay sarcophagi, seals and seal cylinders, clay bowls, enameled and plain vases, playthings, weapons, weights, gold and silver ornaments, objects in stone, bronze and iron, ancient intaglios and bas-reliefs, with a collection of human skulls, will all doubtless be described in this superb and anxiously awaited publication.

In addition to these American discoveries, excavations have been conducted by the French in a group of mounds under the name of Tello, in Southern Babylonia, of which Mr. de Sarzeé was, and is still, the director; by the Turkish government, under the protectorate of the present Sultan, amid the ruins of Abu-Habba; by the greatest English archaeologists, especially the renowned Sayce, in Egypt, and particularly at the village of Tel-el-Amarna, on the eastern bank of the Nile, midway between the towns of Minieh and Assiout; in Arabia by the indefatigable Dr. Edward Glaser; in Palestine and other lands of the Orient. The dreary solitudes that long brooded over these buried civilizations have begun to disappear before the labors of dauntless and indefatigable explorers, and a literature, almost overwhelming in extent, graven in clay and stone, transports us back to the very cradle of the race. They reveal a perfection of art, a marvelousness of correspondence, a development of civilization in those primeval days that excite the wonder and admiration of our more enlightened age. Schools and libraries must have existed everywhere; clay books were stored in the cities; letters of every description were exchanged on every subject; and, judging from the tablets of Tel-el-Amarna, Canaan was a center of correspondence, even before the age of the Exodus. The objection of the "higher critics" that Moses could not have written the Pentateuch because the art of writing was unknown in his day falls, therefore, hopelessly to the ground.

Let us now examine what bearing the results of archaeology has upon the literature of the Old Testament.

The monumental remains of the tribes and nations contemporaneous with Israel and the Patriarchs afford us a secondary revelation to that embodied in the Hebrew Scriptures. It is the province of Oriental Archaeology to deal with the peoples,

countries, and languages of the Bible so as to exhibit their true relations to Bible teaching. As auxiliary to the Old Testament history, and as illustrating its literature, archaeological facts, properly interpreted, are richly supplementary to what is material in the revelation of God, apart from what is spiritual and ideal. While the monuments can not be said to "confirm" the historical accuracy of the Old Testament, they are a most important illustration of the method of its composition. Some of the theories advanced, and the facts unquestionably established, seem subversive of traditional ideas and pre-existing conceptions of inspiration, but nothing has yet been produced that seriously affects the integrity, authenticity or authority of Divine Revelation. If it can be proven, according to Sayce, that, "the historical books of the Old Testament in their present form are compilations of comparatively late date," which seems more and more improbable as the results of the discoveries are investigated, nevertheless the impregnable foundation remains, that, whatever the sources of information available to the inspired writers, they were unerringly guided by the Holy Ghost. When, for instance, it is claimed that the Sabbath and week of seven days had its first home in Babylon, or the narrative of the creation is ultimately of Babylonian origin, there is nothing in these statements inconsistent with a belief in a Primitive Revelation. The great similarity between the Babylonian and Hebrew accounts of the Creation, Deluge, etc., may be evidence of a common kinship but not of a conscious borrowing.

Moreover the truth is never ashamed nor afraid to face facts. It invites investigation and critical examination. We heartily concur in the words of the Archbishop of Canterbury, who is the reputed author of the recent encyclical issued by the Fourth Lambeth Conference. He says: "The critical study of the Bible by competent scholars is essential to the maintenance in the church of a healthy faith. That faith is already in serious danger which refuses to face questions that may be raised either on the authority or the genuineness of the Scriptures that have come down to us. Such refusal creates painful suspicion in the minds of men, whom we have to teach, and will weaken the

strength of our own conviction of the truth that God has revealed to us. A faith which is always or often attended by a secret fear that we dare not inquire lest inquiry should lead us to results inconsistent with what we believe, is already infected with a disease which may soon destroy it. But all inquiry is attended with a danger, on the other side, unless it be protected by the guard of reverence, confidence and patience." (*Literary Digest*, Sept. 4, 1897). Then, too, the facts brought to light by Archaeology are everywhere promulgated in the current literature of the day; archaeological research and study are the latest literary *fad*; and sooner or later every earnest reader of the Bible must be brought to face the theories and facts and to formulate some sort of interpretation of them. It is a timid faith indeed that shrinks from the statement of the latest conclusions of the archaeologist, however astounding or radical they appear in the presence of previous traditional opinions.

Before proceeding to set forth some of the claims of the archaeologists in reference to the origin of the Old Testament it is well to mention the four different main "sources" of the oldest inspired writings. There is, first of all, the so-called "Priestly Code," which includes the greater part of the law in Leviticus and Numbers, and the detailed description of the Tabernacle in Exodus; the account of the Creation in Genesis i, the genealogies in Genesis v, and several passages in the history of the patriarchs, etc. Two other sources of a more popular nature are also recognized: One of these is called the "Jehovistic," in which God is always called Yahveh or Jehovah. To this belongs the account of the Creation in Genesis ii, the story of Paradise and the Fall, that of the Tower of Babel, and, in short, everything in the nature of popular narrative. The other popular source runs parallel with the Jehovistic, from the time of the Patriarchs to the history of the Exodus and the conquest of Canaan. This is the *Elohistic*, which derives its designation from the older form of the divine name. The fourth source is Deuteronomy, or the fifth Book of Moses, which some of the "higher critics" claim to be a pious forgery in the time of the Kings, most probably Josiah.

But it is the contention of some of the greatest Oriental Archaeologists that these "sources" of the Old Testament are not original in themselves, but are derived from foreexisting documents, and even traditions of nations contemporaneous with Israel, or antedating its origin. Even so eminent a man as Sayce, of Oxford, who disclaims belonging to the school of the higher critics, attempts to prove the Babylonian Canaanitish and Egyptian elements in the Book of Genesis, demonstrates the Egyptian tutelage of Israel, and makes the historical books of the Old Testament the works of Biblical compilers. "The facts contained in them are trustworthy, and have been honestly copied from older and in many cases contemporaneous documents; it is only their setting and framework, the order in which they are arranged, and the links of connection by which they are bound together that belong to the later compiler." (*The Higher Criticism and the Monuments*, p. 409).

In this scholarly volume portions of an Assyrian epic of the Creation, first brought to light by Mr. George Smith, are quoted at length, and the resemblances and differences between the Biblical and Babylonian accounts are fully set forth. The author contends that these cosmological accounts are two strikingly alike to be purely accidental. The resemblances extend even to words. From the discoveries made in Babylonia and at Tel-el-Amarna, we have learnt how deep and lasting was the influence of Babylonian culture and literature upon pre Israelitish Canaan. The Biblical compiler, it is claimed, was acquainted, either directly or indirectly, with the Assyrian and Babylonian traditions. At the same time, the Biblical narrative is stripped of all that was distinctively Babylonian and polytheistic, and becomes a sober narrative, breathing a spirit of the purest and most exalted monotheism. The coincidence, too, is remarkable that in the Assyrian epic of the creation there are two accounts, corresponding to the Biblical "Elohistic" and "Jehovistic" accounts, and these similarities are fully exhibited by Sayce. Judging from the cuneiform inscriptions even the creation scenery is Babylonian. The names of Eden, and of the rivers were derived from the language of Babylonia. The names of the cherubim

who guarded the tree of life and of the trees themselves have the same origin. Even the "mist that went up from the land and watered the whole face of the ground," the dust of the ground out of which man was formed, and the very names "Adam" and "Eve" have their Babylonian counterparts and analogies. The same thesis is advanced in connection with the story of the Deluge, "the ethnological table" in Genesis x, the Tower of Babel, Genesis xiv, etc. While archaeology has reclaimed Nimrod from the region of myth, into which he had been relegated by the higher criticism, still "the accounts of the Creation and the Flood, moreover, have shown us that Babylonian documents underlie alike the Elohist and Jehovist narratives. It is only in the treatment of them that the narratives differ from one another." (Sayce's *Higher Criticism and the Monuments*, p. 172).

In another chapter of this great book, which the author writes as an Archaeologist and not as a Theologian, there is a presentation of the so called Canaanitish and Egyptian Elements in the Book of Genesis. Among the many surprises which the Tel-el-Amarna tablets had in store for us was the discovery that after all Melchizedek might well have been a historical personage. The story of this mysterious man, "without father and without mother," is "derived from the old clay records of Jerusalem that made their way into the pages of Genesis through the distorting medium of tradition." The stories of Abraham and Sarah, their migrations in Canaan, the accounts of the other patriarchs and the residence of the Israelites in Egypt have their sources largely in Palestinian, Babylonian, Edomite and Egyptian documents. In a similar way the whole history and development of the Israelitish nation are treated and their roots fastened in the contemporaneous documents of other nations. Such are the conclusions of a few of the specialists in the department of archaeological research, and they can only be successfully refuted by original study of the documents themselves with equal skill in deciphering and interpreting them.

It is true that in many instances the facts are still so imperfectly known as to make the conclusions drawn from them prob-

able only. It is also true that a conclusion which seems certain and evident to one student may not seem equally certain and evident to another. "In all departments of study, more especially in history and archaeology, there are certain groups of facts which admit of more than one explanation." Hypotheses confidently advanced and enthusiastically supported, especially in the empiric stage of science, are frequently superseded by a series of theories before one is discovered to explain the facts. Bryce in his "American Commonwealth" says, that, upon his return to England he pitched overboard half his first theories of the American life and government.

Our tardiness in accepting the advanced views of even the greatest archaeologists is amply justified by their own concessions and more carefully revised opinions. In a recent issue of *The Young Man*, Prof. Sayce is quoted as saying: "I have come to disbelieve thoroughly in the so called critical view of the composition of the Pentateuch. I believe that substantially it is the work of the Mosaic age, and of Moses himself." Doubtless his views may have undergone a similar change, upon further study and investigation, in regard to the origin of other Old Testament writings. The records upon which these claims are founded are very imperfect and fragmentary. Enthusiastic scholars, working in the nebulous atmosphere of uncertainty, may too readily interpret facts in the light of preconceived theories and conjectures. A good deal of the historical criticism which has been passed upon the Old Testament is criticism which seems to imagine that the compilers of the Old Testament books were German scholars, surrounded by the volumes of their libraries, and writing in awe of the reviewers.

It will not do, however, to brush aside all the facts of Archaeology, as untrustworthy or as baseless assumptions. Many of its statements are proven, while some are self-evident. The monuments, when their dates are accurately ascertained, furnish an important supplementary evidence that at least some portions of the Hebrew Scriptures are foreshadowed by extra-Israelitish traditions though they are not copied from them. Such demonstrations do not at all overthrow the Old Testament as the in-

spired word of God, while such a catastrophe may be the fate of the old traditional opinion of verbal inspiration.

Considered altogether, the discoveries and results of archaeology are unfavorable to the assumptions and pretensions of the higher, negative or modern destructive criticism of the Old Testament, which has strenuously attempted to remand the composition of the books to later dates and authors than those to whom they have been generally referred. "That primary assumption of the late use of writing for literary purposes in Palestine, which, consciously or unconsciously, has done so much to wreck the belief of the critic in the early narratives of the Bible, has been shown to be utterly false. The cuneiform inscriptions have restored the historical credit of certain passages of the Pentateuch which had been resolved into myth, and have demonstrated the worthlessness of the arguments by which their mythic character had been maintained. The archaeology of Genesis seems to show that the literary analysis of the book must be revised, and that the confidence with which one portion of a verse is assigned to one author and another portion of it to another is a confidence begotten of the study of modern critical literature and not of the literature of the past. Such microscopic analysis is the result of short sight." (Sayce's *Higher Criticism and the Monuments*, p. 561.)

Not only the monuments, which have proven such richly supplementary evidence of the correctness of Old Testament chronology and history, but the internal evidence of the writings themselves and their common sense interpretation demonstrate the preposterous pretensions of this arrogant type of criticism. Look, for instance, at the Deuteronomic legislation, making a definite and repeated claim to be Mosaic, and which our critics hold to be a product of King Josiah's time. It prescribes laws which would be utterly senseless as productions of this later period. The order, for example, is given to Israel, after their settlement in Canaan to wipe out Amelek, and not to forget it; when, in the time of Josiah, Amelek had already long since wholly disappeared from history. "They are also commanded to destroy the Canaanites who had then ceased to be of any

importance whatever. A law is made against Ammon and Moab, and in favor of Edom, which exactly reverses the real relations of these peoples to Israel in the time of Josiah. Directions are given for choosing a king, it being assumed that they have none, several hundred years after the anointing of Saul. An organization of the Israelitish army is presupposed, wholly out of place in the days of kingly authority. Mourning customs are forbidden, clearly allowed and practiced in the time of Josiah and later; which, whatever else it may prove, is entirely inconsistent with the theory that Deuteronomy originated in his day. To say of these laws that they are a part of the fictitious coloring given by the writer to his work that it might seem Mosaic is to make of the deception a monstrosity, to no one more embarrassing than to the critics themselves." (Bissell's *Pentateuch: Its Origin and Structure*, p. 18.)

It is hardly a surprise that all this hypothesis of pious fraud on the part of the imaginative post-exilian writers should be completely overturned and annihilated by the discoveries in Egyptology and Assyriology. The theory that presupposes that the Hebrew Scriptures are little more than a tissue of fabrications finds no support from archaeology but its most overwhelming refutation. The literature already unearthed by the explorers and excavators in Bible lands exceeds in compass the whole of the Old Testament, and the cuneiform texts discovered in Egypt and Assyria alone are estimated to fill five hundred octavo volumes.

In the face of this extensive monumental literature there is nothing that has affected the integrity of the Old Testament as God's primitive revelation, nor anything that has invalidated its authenticity as the inspired word of God. At the same time, many of the conclusions of the older school of commentators and apologists have undergone modification or been entirely rejected because they are not supported by the indisputable evidence of the monuments. As Schmauk observes in his excellent little book on *The Higher Criticism*, p. 216: "The negative theory ignored the results of Egyptian and Assyrian research at first,

and now reluctantly admits them, as far as they do not clash with the preconceived premises, fundamental to the existence of the negative theory." The striking analogies between the Biblical narratives and those of contemporaneous nations, as deciphered from the monuments, are no indications whatever that either of the accounts are copies of the others. All depends upon the dates of both, and the great preponderance of evidence shows an equal antiquity in the language, history, and literature of Israel with that of any other nation.

In confirmation of this now generally accepted fact, Dr. Fritz Hommel has recently published a work in which he exhaustively compares the Hebrew personal names with the contemporary names of similar formation among the surrounding nations, and proves, from the contemporary inscriptions, their existence in the ages of Abram and Moses, and the impossibility of a later post-exilic invention. This celebrated work by the Professor of Semitic languages in the University of Munich entitles him to a place among the foremost Philologists and Assyriologists of the age. (See *The Ancient Hebrew Tradition as Illustrated by the Monuments*, p. 350, New York, E. and J. B. Young & Co). Hommel deals with the cardinal question of the dates themselves, upon which the issue with the higher critics hangs, and by an irresistible array of philological and archæological evidence establishes the contemporaneous existence of the Old Testament records with the events they described.

The arguments and subject-matter of Hommel's remarkable book are too abstruse and compact to admit of any recapitulation within the necessary limits of this article, but the result of his over-mastering researches and studies may be given in his own language: "In conclusion, let us consider, for a moment, the practical effect of all the evidence from the Tel-el-Amarna tablets—dating from the period 1430 and 1400 B. C.—and from the Minaean and Egyptian inscriptions. Far from obliging us to modify in any way the traditional view of Old Testament history, or from placing a weapon in the hands of its opponents, it tends on the contrary, to confirm—indirectly it is true—the accuracy of the Old Testament narrative, and at the

same time fill up a gap in it, by enabling us to reconstruct the history of the period which preceded the conquest of Palestine by Joshua, about the year 1230 B. C.

The ancient Hebrew tradition—and more especially that part of it which deals with the earliest times—has, in many instances, come down to us in a merely fragmentary and mutilated condition. But even isolated references and allusions, such as those which occur in regard to the land of Ashur, Heber and Malki-el, Hebron, etc., etc., when supplemented by the external evidence that lies at our hand, are shown to be ancient and authentic tradition, and thus supply further testimony to the existence of *pre-Mosaic* records." (The Ancient Hebrew Tradition, pp. 266–267). There is evidently not much comfort in this opinion of one of the world's greatest Assyriologists for the latter-day *post-exilian* theorists.

There is an increasing vigorous reaction against the Wellhausen school of higher critics. It has lately received some fatal blows from such men as Klostermann of Europe, and Professor Green, of the University of Princeton. The latter eminent scholar has lately sent forth a comprehensive volume, (*The Unity of the Book of Genesis*), with the aim of entirely disproving the alleged existence of different sources in the Pentateuch, and calling attention with pitiless logic to the numerous weak points—the "hair-splitting and atom-dividing" efforts—of the so-called modern critics. It is unquestionable that these microscopic destructionists have gone virtually bankrupt in their attempt to unravel, not only chapter by chapter, but verse by verse, and clause by clause, the web in which the different reputed sources are entangled, arguing frequently from premises which are entirely false.

The results of oriental Archaeology and their bearing upon the Old Testament writings should be welcomed, rather than despised. They are a test of the truthfulness and credibility of the narratives that have been transmitted to us from those primitive ages. "They too bring before our view a civilized and cultured society; they too tell us of cities and kingdoms and empires, and of the intercourse that went on between them.

The Egypt and Canaan they describe are, it is true, the civilized Egypt and Canaan of later times; but they are also the civilized Egypt and Canaan which the monuments now assure us already existed in the patriarchal age. The features of the civilization presupposed by the Book of Genesis are not borrowed from the period of the kings or of Babylonian exile; the Egyptian monuments have proved that they belong to the age of the patriarchs themselves." (Sayce on Research in Egypt, edited by Hilprecht, p. 111).

In many ways the cuneiform records of the East are valuable illustrations and supplements of the ancient Hebrew literature. Some of them have been indicated in articles by Professor J. F. McCurdy and others in the *Sunday School Times* and other current publications. The standing review of this department of study in the *Homiletic Review* conducted by Dr. William Hayes Ward, entitled "Light on Scriptural Texts from Recent Discoveries," ought to keep every intelligent pastor at least in touch with the subject. The facts of Biblical Archaeology and their relation to the Old Testament ought to be so generally diffused as to become a part of every man's store of knowledge. Those who have carefully examined these facts will find that the following are some of the points in which archaeological research has rendered important service in promoting a better understanding of the Old Testament.

We have a fuller comprehension of the extent of the Deluge, and the meaning of the geographical distribution of the human race in Genesis x. The fourteenth chapter, giving the account of Abraham's repulse of the eastern confederacy headed by the Elamites, is now intelligible; even the leaders of the invasion and their motives are explained by the monumental inscriptions. That most remarkable nation, the Hittites, has found a new history in the subterranean chambers of Palestine and Asia Minor. The Book of Kings has a wonderfully surprising explanation. The interaction between the Palestinian states and the great empires of Babylonia and Assyria has been fully exhibited from the cuneiform records of those ages. The relations between the Northern Kingdom of Israel with that of Damascus are set

in the clearest light. "Ahab, in the singular alliance of Benhadad II, appears as a member of the league of the western principalities, against the invasion of Shalmaneser II of Assyria. Their defeat in 854 gives us the first sure date in Biblical chronology,—a point of time from which we reckon back to David, Saul, and Samuel." (*Recent Research in Bible Lands*, pp. 22–23).

From the monuments we learn how Jehu, fierce and tyrannical, became a fawning suppliant to Shalmaneser; and how, a century later, Ahab of Judah invoked the protection of Tiglathpileser III, against the alliance of Damascus and Syria. Assyriology has here furnished us with the master key to the whole political history of the ancient East in this eventful period of Jewish history.

At the same time the principal epochs in the history of Judah receive an additional illumination. The contests of its Kings, the victories and defeats of its armies, its alliance with disaffected states against the mightier empires, its revolts against oppressors, all receive from the inscriptions an ample illumination. In these indestructible records of contemporaneous nations the mysterious silence of the Scriptures is broken, its necessary gaps filled in, its history and chronology vindicated and established. The wonderful guidance of God over his chosen people in their apostasies and wanderings, their pathway of light among the nations, is traced in these cuneiform records, while the written revelation finds its counterpart and supplement in that imperishable history engraved in stone.

Moreover, archaeological study has contributed in no small degree to our ever-increasing knowledge of the manners, customs and institutions of the Hebrew nation in the days of its existence as the peculiar people of God. The Biblical language and distinctive phrases of the inner life of the people gather a new light and meaning, under the almost magic touch of archaeology, as the spade of the excavator disentombs the civilizations of the past, and makes long-silent voices live again. It is the high and peculiar function of Philology and Archaeology to restore something of the native power and beauty to the words

which "holy men of old spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost."

The monuments are the complements of the history and prophecy of Israel, and serve to exhibit and amplify the lessons taught by both. The vast field in which these treasures are stored can not be neglected or ignored by any who seek to be intelligent or well-informed, or, more than all, to have a wider comprehension of the truth of inspiration. Nothing can be gained by ignoring facts, which have already been rendered ubiquitous by the almost omniscient eye of the newsmonger and publisher. It will not do to sneer at the archaeologists as critical, or credulous, or untrustworthy philologists. Sooner or later, facts have a way of revenging themselves, and the facts of oriental archaeology are no exception to the rule.

Really, archaeology itself has nothing to do with theology or the Holy Scriptures. The discoveries of the Klondyke have nothing to do with questions of currency or monetary legislation. Empiricists can not decide upon theories of the rationalists, nor upon the dogmas of theologians, though they sometimes attempt to do so. The archaeologist interprets the discoveries and writes for the historian, not for the homilist or the defender of the Bible. The facts he deals with are historical, and are to be judged like all other historical facts in accordance with the canons of historical reasoning.

The churchmen of the middle ages might have as well forbidden Galileo to use his telescope and condemn him to the horrors of the Inquisition as we to pour out our maledictions upon the archaeologists or take on a supercilious air when their work is mentioned.

From all that has been discovered and published on the subject, the records of the Old Testament have not been seriously affected by the comparison with the records of the monuments, but have rather received a most valuable vindication. This is nothing more than a confident and courageous faith in the providence and power of God can ever anticipate. He that "hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on the face of the whole earth, and hath determined the times before appointed,

and the bounds of their habitation," though he left them for awhile "to walk in their own ways," has surely so guided and disposed all the events of human history and progress that his word of truth shall stand as the imperishable rock, against the assaults of Satan and the wicked devices of men, and overcome all at last and remain overwhelmingly triumphant. An absolute faith,—which alone becomes a true child of God,—can challenge any scrutiny or examination of the word of God, and stand unmoved by the slightest apprehension.

ARTICLE IX.

REVIEW OF RECENT LITERATURE.

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS, NEW YORK.

Later Gleanings. A new series of Gleanings of Past Years. By the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone. pp. 426. \$1.25.

These later gleanings embrace a number of well-known papers, theological and ecclesiastical, with which the "Grand Old Man" has favored the Christian public during the last twelve years. Their sweep reaches from "The Dawn of Creation" to the question of "The Validity of Angelican Orders," including such memorable monographs as "Robert Elsemere," "True and False Conceptions of the Atonement," "The Swine Miracle," "The Church under Henry VIII.," etc., etc.

The range is probably too large for any one writer, whatever his versatility. With all his vigor of thought, force of logic and charm of rhetoric, Mr. Gladstone after all impresses the studious reader with the fact that he is not a specialist. He has grand weapons in his common sense and in his firm faith in the Scriptures. Yet it may be questioned whether he does effective battle with giants who are recognized masters in their special domain. As Luther used to say, some questions should be reserved for the doctors.

Nevertheless these papers are not only entertaining, but they offer a very solid sort of mental and moral diet, and their presentation in this permanent form will be welcomed by multitudes of the thinking world.

E. J. W.

A History of the Hebrew People from the Division of the Kingdom to the Fall of Jerusalem in 586 B. C. By Charles Foster Kent, Ph. D. With Maps and Chart. pp. 218. \$1.25.

A notice of volume I, of this admirable History of the Hebrew People appeared in these pages one year ago. Vol. II sustains the high

appreciation which that one called forth. Pitched on the views of the modern critical school, and occupied not so much with negative problems as with the positive results of criticism, on which there is substantial agreement among the scholars, it presents these in a simple, lucid style which adapts the work to the ordinary Sunday School Teacher and Bible Student, as well as to the more favored members of College and Seminary classes to whom it will be largely assigned as a text-book.

E. J. W.

A Concordance to the Greek Testament, according to the Texts of Westcott and Hort, Tischendorf and the English Revisers. Edited by Rev. F. W. Moulton, M. A., D. D., and Rev. A. S. Geden. Square Royal 8vo. pp. 1037. \$7.00

One of the noblest endeavors of Christian scholarship in the present century has been the laborious effort to secure an approximately pure text of the New Testament. The text of Westcott and Hort is now generally accepted as registering the results of criticism and as most worthy of confidence, and it is for this text, including references to the eighth edition of Tischendorf and that of the English revisers, that we have here a complete Concordance. The work accordingly differs from and supersedes all its predecessors in this, that they were intended solely for the *Textus Receptus*, while the present work is directed to the text of the Greek Testament as exhibited in the three modern critical editions.

Even marginal readings have in all cases been included. Accordingly no word or phrase which finds a place in any of these editions is excluded from this Concordance; nothing which is absent from them is present here. The method employed precludes the omission of any expression which, by even a remote probability, might be regarded as forming part of the true text of the New Testament, while passages disappear, as to the spuriousness of which there is practical unanimity among scholars. By the use of asterisks it is indicated whether words are met with or not in the Septuagint or other Greek versions of the Old Testament, including the Apocrypha, while the dagger denotes that as far as available information goes the word in question does not occur in Greek writers earlier than the Christian era. Citations are generally long enough to show in what construction a word occurs, and the original Hebrew is presented immediately under the Greek.

The plan of the work and the execution of it leave nothing to be desired. It is a magnificent addition to the equipment of Biblical Students. It not only places at their command an immediate reference to the most trustworthy text of every verse of the New Testament, but it supplies them with the very best aid of interpreting the New Testament Scriptures. Incomparably better than any extant commentary is the method which interprets Scripture by Scripture, the more obscure passages by the help of the more luminous ones, words and phrases of

doubtful meaning in one connection by their self-evident sense when they appear in another connection, and for this purpose this concordance is indispensable and invaluable.

E. J. W.

The Bible and Islam, or The Influence of the Old and New Testaments on the Religion of Mohammed. By Henry Preserved Smith, D. D. pp. 319. \$1.50.

This volume is the Ely Lectures for 1897, the series in which "Christianity and Positivism" by Dr. McCosh and "The Divine Origin of Christianity Indicated by its Historical Effects" by Dr. Storrs, appears. The author is Dr. Smith of Lane Seminary fame. The book is a study of Islam. It was the author's purpose to discover, in so far as possible, the forces which have made Islam. He approached his task with warm admiration for Mohammed and certainly the Prophet of Allah could ask for no fairer judge of his life and his work. The author finds in Mohammed a deeply religious nature, susceptible to the truths of Christianity with which he came in contact in Arabia in the seventh century. The type of Christianity was that of primitive Ebionism. The fact that Mohammed took so large a part of his material from the Old Testament does not disprove its Christian sources. His description of Judgment shows features which could have been borrowed only from the Gospel account. He recognized Jesus as one of the chief prophets. He seemed to have a deep appreciation of the spiritual truths of Christianity; but her distinctive doctrines he was utterly incapable of assimilating,—the doctrine of the Trinity, the Sonship of Christ, the Incarnation, the Atonement, etc. The excellence of Islam is thoroughly indicated by the author. He recognizes also the tenacity with which Islam clings to the past, but he believes that the religious capacity of Islam will yet open to the higher truth which we enjoy.

H. C. A.

CHRISTIAN LITERATURE COMPANY, NEW YORK.

The Psalter and Canticles. Pointed for Chanting to the Gregorian Psalm Tones, for the use of Evangelical Lutheran Congregations. Edited by Harry G. Archer and Rev. Luther D. Reed, with an introduction by Rev. D. H. Geissinger, D. D. 6½ x 8½. pp. 476. Cloth. \$1.25.

Mr. Archer is the organist of the First Church, Pittsburg, Pa. Mr. Reed is pastor of Emanuel Church, Allegheny, Pa. The work has been prepared for the use of Lutheran congregations. The editors give an interesting account, in the preface, of Ancient Plain Song, and of the Psalm Tones, in their use in the Church from very ancient time. Dr. Geissinger, in the introduction, says, "This work claims to reproduce the oldest and finest form of worship music. The melodies to which the entire Psalter is here arranged have strong claims to an antiquity long

antedating the Christian Church in her New Testament form. * * * They are our legitimate inheritance together with the Psalms themselves."

What is here attempted is new and we have no basis on which to estimate the value of the work. However, as all that the editors ask for their book is a fair trial, we cordially commend it to our musicians.

H. C. A.

WOLCOTT AND WEST, SYRACUSE, N. Y.

Crucifixion. By John H. Osborne. pp. 85. 60 cents.

We do not feel that we can endorse Mr. Osborne's views on the crucifixion and death of Christ, and our lack of familiarity with the details of the Roman method of crucifixion, as presented by the author, disqualifies us for criticism of that portion of the book, which, as a whole, seems to have no *raison d'être*.

H. C. A.

EATON AND MAINS, NEW YORK.

The Librarian of the Sunday School. By Elizabeth Louisa Foote, A. B., B. L. S. pp. 86. 35 cents.

This is an excellent little manual for use in Sunday School libraries, and we should be glad to see the suggestions it gives put into general practice.

H. C. A.

The Greater Gospel. By John M. Bamford. pp. 159. 50 cents.

Under the title of "The Greater Gospel," Mr. Bamford gives an account of four meetings in a city church during the course of which the minister asks some questions concerning the spiritual life, and is answered by "testimony" from several persons supposed to represent the different phases of society. Some pages are readable, but, as a whole, the treatment is so commonplace and inartistic as to rob the book of both interest and literary value.

H. C. A.

LUTHERAN PUBLICATION SOCIETY, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Philip Jacob Spener: Augustus Hermann Francke. By Marie E. Richard. Cloth, pp. 154. 40 cents.

This is the first of THE LUTHERAN HAND-BOOK SERIES, which is announced to be a series of short, popular biographies of distinguished Lutherans, brief manuals of Lutheran history, Lutheran life and benevolent work. The Publication Society is to be congratulated upon sending out as a forerunner of these little books so worthy a volume as this. Spener and Francke are household words in Lutheran homes; Spener, the man of thought, Francke, the man of faith. The former roused the Church from spiritual death; the latter incited her to good works. The story of each is told in a delightful way, marked by fine discrimination of character. The author has given a valuable analysis of the Pietistic Movement in Chapter VI. Part I.

H. C. A.

The Country Charge. By Marie E. Richard. pp. 208. 75 cents.

This little book is the story of a young clergyman who, after having received what in this country would be considered a good preparation for a scholarly career, decides to accept the small country charge of Sandown, in order, as he candidly admits, that he may have half his time for study and so more thoroughly prepare himself "to serve the Church with accurate and broad scholarship." He thinks of the work there merely as something to be done while he is fitting himself for his life-work. But with the first Sunday in the country charge comes the revelation which makes a new man of him,—namely, the realization that *that* is the Master's work; that *he* has been *called* to do it; and that no attainments of scholarship could yield the joy he would experience in leading these simple people back to the Father's house. From that hour his life is a free and joyous giving of himself for the people who are now the people of his choice, because here are "human life and its immortality; human love and its outpouring; the hurt and the healing of death, and the thought of its resurrection glory." The one task he especially sets himself is the unraveling of the mystery which surrounds the death of Mac. Laird, and this is not accomplished until the close of the book, when the reconciliation between embittered hearts takes place at the deathbed of the young minister who has given his life for them. But there is no sense of tragedy or sacrifice attending his death. He comes to it in the line of his work, and it is just a happy going into the other part of life, where he may more perfectly serve.

The plot is a good one. The development merits less praise. There are signs of hasty composition in the sometimes faulty English and in the conversations which lack that indefinable literary quality which makes a conversation which might not offend the *ear* equally pleasing to the *eye*. But, while the style of the book cannot be taken as representative of the author's best efforts and we look for better literary work from her in the future, the story leaves a distinctly pleasant impression, and we are grateful to Harold Brewster for having lived.

H. C. A.

HOUGHTON, MIFFLIN AND CO., BOSTON.

The Chief End of Man. By George S. Merriam. pp. 296. \$1.50.

In the Prologue the author states that "In the fivefold division of the book, 'Our spiritual Ancestry,' is a bird's-eye view of the main line of advance which culminates in 'The Ideal of To-Day.' A more leisurely retrospect of certain historical passages is given in 'A Traveler's Note-Book;,' thoughts on the present aspects are grouped under 'Glimpses;,' and 'Daily Bread' introduces a homely and familiar treatment."

The outline is charming, and we follow the author with delight as he begins to sweep the field of history in order to discern what have been the contributions to ethical and religious thought of such men as Homer, Sophocles, Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, Lucretius, Epictetus. But

when Christianity comes into view, we wonder what has happened to our telescope. The focus has been lost, and what we are gazing at is shadow, not substance!

Mr. Merriam fails at just the point where all other Unitarian writers have failed, when he tries to retain the beauty and form of Christianity while denying its motive force. He refuses to acknowledge that the "Ideal of To-Day," "fidelity to the best we know, and search always for the best," has been made possible only by the power which the *risen* Christ infused into his disheartened and hopeless followers. In place of the Christ who *for our sakes became* poor, who was *willing* to be despised and rejected and crucified that he might open to us the way of salvation, and who rose from the dead to give us a sure hope of everlasting life, Mr. Merriam puts before us his idea of the Christian theology, which he calls "a system of myths,"—"the initial fact of which was a good man whose love went out to bad men and woke in them a sense of their own wrong along with a new hope and joy." The resurrection of Jesus was wholly imaginary, this author thinks. "The hope of immortality is born from a sense of the value of life," and Jesus' life was so perfect that the disciples felt that it *could not* be lost to them. "And first in one mind, then in another, the conviction flashed into bodily image," until, "the story, as it grew with years, was accepted as the charter and foundation of the little society."

Mr. Merriam thinks the "Christian mythology" is fast being outgrown by the thoughtful and spiritual men of this age; but while he asserts that "we have, to-day, a knowledge of man and the world which enables us to build on broader foundations than Jesus or St. Francis," he not only fails to show what these foundations are, but he makes positive misstatements in order to discredit the "mythology" he has discarded.

H. C. A.

T. AND T. CLARK, EDINBURG.

Imported by Charles Scribner's Sons.

The Prophecies of Jesus Christ, Relating to His Death, Resurrection and Second Coming, and Their Fulfilment. By Dr. Paul Schwartz Kopff, Translated by Rev. Neil Buchanan. pp. 328. \$1.75.

This is the fourth part of a work, the full title of which will be "The Revelation of God in Jesus Christ, its Content, Range and Limits." The last part of the book is published first, because it deals with questions which are receiving extraordinary attention in present day theology. The standpoint of the Göttingen Professor is, that to the infallibility of the content of Jesus' revelation, positively guaranteed by his sinlessness, there attach certain imperfections of the form in which he conceived and proclaimed that revelation. While the contents of his predictions are referred to the infallible revelation of the Son of God, defects must have adhered to him as a prophet.

He argues his position with the thoroughness of a German theolo-

gian, though it will require the complete work to establish the tenability of his position. Students will be startled by some of the concessions made in order to maintain truths which can not be surrendered. It sounds strange, indeed, to hear a Christian teacher maintain that "Jesus held certain mistaken notions even in points that in some way concerned the form of his revelation," but the author always guards such an admission with the counter-claim that not the kernel of his revelation, only the husk was "not entirely inaccessible to error." And no religious value attaches to that.

Since no one denies the Saviour's humanity, it must be acknowledged that his mind was also a really human mind. The necessary implication seems to be that it must have been subject to the limitations which circumscribe the mental life of man.

Among the things which cannot be shaken are Christ's prediction of his resurrection, and its fulfilment confirmed in the reality and coporeity of his post-resurrection appearances. This taken with the conviction of the sinlessness and divinity of Jesus Christ firmly asserted, shows that such discussions are designed to clarify and fortify faith and not to destroy it.

E. J. W.

FLOOD AND VINCENT, MEADVILLE, PA.

Imperial Germany. A Critical study of Fact and Character. By Sidney Whitman, F. R. G. S., Author of "The Realm of the Hapsburgs," "Teuton Studies," "The Story of Austria," etc. pp. 330.

The Social Spirit in America. By C. R. Henderson, Associate Professor of Sociology in the University of Chicago. pp. 350.

Roman Life in Pliny's Time. By Maurice Pellison. Translated from the French by Maud Wilkinson, with an Introduction by Frank Justus Miller, Professor in the University of Chicago. pp. 315.

A Short History of Mediæval Europe. By Oliver J. Thatcher, Ph.D. pp. 309.

Roman and Mediæval Art. Illustrated. By William H. Goodyear, Lecturer to the Brooklyn Institute.

These constitute the required literature in the Chautauqua course for 1897-'98.

The first book named is the latest revision of this work, first published about eight years ago. Errors have been eliminated and valuable new data added. It comes from a faithful student of German history. It covers only *Imperial Germany*, a period of intense interest, not surpassed indeed in the recent history of any other nation for the same number of years. It will be observed that the title-page characterizes the book as "a critical study of fact and character." And so it is. It has a record of facts and deeds of men and enough of statistics, but its main merit lies in the discussions that cover most of its pages. With some of the views here expressed the reader may not agree, but

he will agree that they are presented most attractively and plausibly. Though not a German himself the author is appreciative of German character, sometimes however not to the degree it merits, as is manifest in what he says of the German in colonization and commerce. In spite of this, even a German will find, as did Bismarck, great pleasure in reading the book.

Among the chapters in "The Social Spirit in America" are discussions of home-making as a social art, better houses for the people, public health, good roads and communication, organizations of wage-earners, political reforms, the social spirit, the State school system, voluntary organization of education, the social spirit in conflict with anti-social institutions. The views presented are discriminating and judicious, and the author exhibits an excellent spirit in treating the most vexed and vexing questions. The healthful tone that pervades the book will do much good among those who read it and who will be called upon to meet these questions.

For a popular and fascinating portrayal of thought and practice during the imperial period at Rome, the book that bears the title "Roman Life in Pliny's Time," is hardly surpassed by any that we have seen. Others tell us as well as this, but not in a way so interesting, of Roman schools, the position of women, of wedding ceremonies and how marriage was regarded, of the ways of transacting business, of the education and methods of the Roman lawyer, of the slaves and their treatment, of the customs of society, of the methods of traveling, of the funeral customs, etc. The letters of Pliny, a typical Roman gentleman, are made to do service here, and they are exceedingly helpful. It has been translated into such excellent English that we doubt whether much has been lost, as is usually the case, in the transition from one language to another. The number of illustrations is quite large, and they are of more than usual excellence.

Our commendation, in the January issue of the *QUARTERLY*, of "Europe in the Middle Age" by Thatcher and Schwill is deserved quite as well by its abridgment, as we find it here in "A Short History of Mediæval Europe." It is not necessary, therefore, to call attention to any special features.

For a like reason we shall merely call attention to "Roman and Mediæval Art" by Goodyear. We had the pleasure of noticing this in our July issue of this year. The whole series of five books makes up a most excellent course of reading.

LEACH, SHEWELL AND SANBORN, BOSTON.

Introduction to American Literature. Including Illustrative Selections with Notes. By F. V. N. Painter, A. M., D. D., Professor of Modern Languages in Roanoke College. pp. 498.

Those who were pleased (and there were many) with Dr. Painter's "Introduction to English Literature" will give a cordial welcome to this

new work from his pen, which is intended to be a companion volume to the other. The plan is substantially the same in each. Five periods are here given with a few representative writers of each period. The other prominent writers are merely named with the titles of their best productions.

Of the special features there are three that mark the book above the others. The one is the careful and comparatively full treatment given to the representative writers with a judicious and discriminating estimate of their works. In these Dr. Painter impresses us as a fair and skillful critic. Another is the "general survey" that serves as an introduction to each period. In these surveys the author seems to grasp with remarkable insight just those features which mark the respective periods and he reveals the special conditions under which the various authors wrote. With these may also be mentioned the excellent general introduction which no reader should omit. The third conspicuous feature is "The Illustrative Selections with Notes." The selections illustrate the distinguishing characteristics of each author, and the notes are helpful to the student in getting a clearer grasp of these characteristics. They are just such notes as the practical teacher feels are best adapted as a help to young students in getting a fair knowledge of representative American literature. The work will unquestionably prove a good text-book in our academies and colleges.

G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS, NEW YORK.

The Occasional Address. Its Composition and Literature. By Lorenzo Sears, L. H. D., Professor in Brown University. Author of "The History of Oratory from the Age of Pericles to the Present Time. PP 343.

The object of Professor Sears in this book is, to present suggestions and methods for the preparation of the occasional address that nearly every man of literary standing is called upon to deliver. Special occasions and anniversaries of special events are constantly coming in rapid succession, and it is well to be in position to respond to the calls so frequently made. The events would better not be celebrated, unless the speaker can meet the requirements of the occasion. This book will give many suggestions for these extra-professional addresses, whether they be in the line of eulogy, commencement oration, political speech, after-dinner speeches, commemorative address, or almost any kind that may be named. These hints apply to the subject of the discourse, its plan, introduction, discussion and conclusion. Students in our colleges and universities will find this book of great assistance in the preparation of the speeches required of them during their course. It is prepared by one who appreciates their needs and who seemed to have them in mind while preparing the chapters of this book. We recommend it to them as well as to those of maturer years who are called upon for speech-making.

PERIODICALS.

The *Atlantic Monthly's* October issue celebrates its fortieth anniversary and it does so in the best possible manner. Not by illuminated and conspicuous covers but by a table of contents which is remarkably choice. A number of the best writers of the day have contributed to this number. Among them are James Lane Allen, F. Hopkinson Smith, Thomas Bailey Aldrich, Henry M. Stanley, Edmund Clarence Stedman, George Kennan, Sarah Orne Jewett and Kate Douglas Wiggin. And they have written on subjects which are full of interest as Two Principles in Recent American Fiction, Twenty-five Years' Progress in Equatorial Africa, Recent Discoveries Respecting the Origin of the Universe, A Russian Experiment in Self Government and similar valuable subjects. The *Atlantic* is, without doubt, the best magazine now published. It entirely disregards any demand for sensational literature and it caters only to the most cultured taste.

Among the magazines just fresh from the press, is the October "*Table Talk*," which is most valuable to house-keepers, for its pages are rife with useful and interesting matter for them, as for instance, under the first head comes "The Fine Art of Serving Eggs;" Dishes, Dainty and Nourishing," by Mrs. M. A. W. Rodger; "Housekeepers Inquiries" and "New Menus and Seasonable Recipes," by Cornelia C. Bedford; "The New Bill of Fare," by Mrs. M. C. Myer, which is full of the latest ideas and newest interests to women, and under the second, "A Driving Tour," or an October outing, by Mrs. Burton Kingsland; "An Approved China Drink," by Martha Bockée Flint, and "Diamond-Back Terrapin," by Calvin D. Wilson. Any of our readers unacquainted with the magazine will receive a sample copy free, if they send name and address to Table Talk Publishing Co., Philadelphia. Pa.

t.

ni-
ed
ly
to
h,
n,
nd
ci-
a-
ni-
le
b-
nd

er
es
e,
s,
rs
C.
ull
c-
s-
nd
rs
ey
a.